

BROWNSON'S
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1849.

- ART. I. — 1. *United States Catholic Magazine and Monthly Review*. Edited by REV. CHARLES I. WHITE, D. D. Baltimore : John Murphy. Vol. VII. 1848.
2. *The Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register*. J. A. M'MASTER, Esq., Editor. New York. Weekly. Vol. IX. 1848.

IF the question were an open one, whether we shall or shall not have a periodical and newspaper press, that is, journalism or no journalism, we are not sure but we should decide in the negative. The press may have its advantages, but it certainly has its disadvantages, and is productive of serious evils. Its natural tendency is to bring literature down to the level of the tastes and attainments of the unreasoning, undisciplined, and conceited multitude, and to lessen the demand for patient thought, sound learning, and genuine science. Under its influence, the more light and superficial literature is, the more popular it becomes, and the richer the reward of its authors. It must be adapted to the most numerous class of readers, and win them by appeals to their prejudices or their passions ; and if profound, if it go to the bottom of things, and treat its subjects scientifically, it will transcend the popular capacity, demand some mental discipline and application on the part of readers, and be rejected as heavy, uninteresting, and therefore worthless. There will be no demand for it in the market, and it will lie on the shelves of the bookseller.

At the same time, too, that the press, in the modern acceptation, tends to make literature light, shallow, and unprofitable, in order to meet the popular demand, it reacts on the public

mind, and unfits it for a literature of a more respectable character. A people accustomed to read only newspapers and the light trash of the day can relish nothing else. The stomach that has long been fed only with slops loses its power to bear solid food. We find every day that even newspapers of the more respectable class are too heavy and too learned for the people. It is but a small minority of their subscribers who read their more elaborate editorials. The majority can find time and patience only to glance the eye over the shorter paragraphs, catch a joke here and an item of news there. Nothing that cannot be read on the run, and comprehended at a glance, is looked upon as worth reading at all. To expect that the mass of readers will read essays of any length and solidity, — unless essays in defence of some humbug, or in exposition of some new theory for turning the world into chaos, — otherwise than by running the eye over them, and catching the first sentence of here and there a paragraph, is to prove one's self a real antediluvian, and a far greater curiosity than the Belgian Giant or the Mammoth Ox.

Moreover, the tendency of the press is to bring before an unprepared public questions that can be profitably discussed only before a professional audience. The people need and can receive the results of the most solid learning and the most profound and subtle philosophy, but they can neither perform nor appreciate the processes by which those results are obtained. Hodge and Goody Jones have little ability to follow the discussion of the higher metaphysical questions, or of the more intricate points of theology. The great body of the people are not and cannot be scholars, philosophers, theologians, or statesmen. They must have teachers and masters, and are as helpless without them as a flock of sheep without a shepherd. Do what you will, they will follow leaders of some sort, and the modern attempt to make them their own teachers and masters results only in exposing them to a multitude of miserable pretenders, who lead them where there is no pasture, and where the wolves congregate to devour them. You may call this aristocracy, priestcraft, want of respect for the people, what you will; it is a fact as plain as the nose on a man's face, proved by all history, and confirmed by daily experience. There is no use, no sense, no honesty, in attempting to deny or to disguise it. There never was a greater humbug than the modern schemes for introducing equality of education, whether by levelling upwards or by levelling downwards. The order of the

world is, — the few lead, the many are led ; and whether you like it or not, you cannot make it otherwise, and every attempt to make it otherwise only makes the matter worse.

It is strange that our wise men, as they would be thought, do not see this. Go into your political world, and is it not so ? What mean, if not, your town, county, state, and national committees, your party organizations, party usages, caucuses, conventions, and nominations prior to elections ? If the people are capable of managing for themselves, of having their own leaders, why do you undertake to lead them ? Why, when the French republicans had overthrown the monarchy, and proclaimed universal suffrage, did they establish their clubs, and send out their commissioners through all the departments, armed with power to compel the people to vote for a given description of candidates for the National Assembly ? If they believed either in the right or the capacity of the people to govern themselves, why did they not trust them ? Who knows not that the fashionable democracy of the day is a humbug, got up by miserable demagogues, solely because by it they, instead of king or nobility, may stand a chance of governing the people, and deriving a profit from them ? Who knows not that the people are as much led under a democracy as under any other form of government, only by a different and, perhaps, a more numerous, as well as a more hungry and despotic, class of leaders ? Who does not know that the despotism your prominent democrats dread is simply the despotism which prevents them from being despots ? O, it goes to an honest man's heart to see how the poor people are deceived, duped, to their own destruction !

We speak not in contempt of the people, or in disregard of their claims. God has made it our duty, for his sake, bound us by our allegiance to him, to love the people, to devote ourselves to their service, to live for them, and, if need be, to die for them. There is nothing too good for them. Scholars, philosophers, teachers, magistrates, all are for them, are bound to live and labor for their temporal and spiritual well-being ; and they neglect the duties of their state, if they do not. That they often do not is but too lamentably true. The people have been most shamefully, sinfully neglected, in all ages and countries of the world, and their wrongs have cried, and do still cry, aloud to Heaven. The rich, the learned, the great, the powerful, too frequently look upon the possessions Almighty God has given them as if they were given them for their own especial benefit, instead of a sacred trust to be employed in the

service of the poor and needy. Their shameful neglect of their duty, their sinful abuse of their trusts, has furnished the occasion to modern radicalism, and given to radicals a pretext for the destructive war they are carrying on against them. But this, though it condemn them, does not justify the radicals, or prove that the people can get on without teachers and rulers. It only proves, that, when their legitimate leaders abuse their trusts, they will grow rebellious and seek a new set of leaders, who will be only less competent and more unfaithful.

Assuming that the people must have leaders, that they cannot dispense with teachers, it is evident that there must be questions which are not proper to be brought before them, — not precisely because of their sacredness, but because of their unintelligibleness to the unprepared intellect; because they involve principles which transcend the reach of the undisciplined mind, and require for the right understanding of them preliminary studies which the bulk of mankind do not and cannot make. The people need and may receive the full benefit of law, and yet they cannot all be lawyers; for the law demands a special study, and a long and painful study, in those who would be worthy legal practitioners. The same may be said of medicine, and with even more truth of theology. Theology requires a professional study, and men, whatever their genius, natural abilities, and general learning, can only blunder the moment they undertake to treat it, unless they have made it a special study, under able and accomplished professors. Theological science does not come, like Dogberry's reading and writing, by nature, is not a natural instinct, your transcendental young ladies to the contrary notwithstanding. To bring it into the forum, and to discuss it before the populace, is only to divest it of all that transcends the popular understanding.

We have seen this among Protestants. Luther and his associates knew perfectly well that their novelties would be instantly rejected in the schools, scouted by professional theologians, called upon to judge them by the laws of theological science; they therefore appealed to the public, to an unprofessional jury, that is, from science to ignorance, as do and must appeal all innovators. They supposed they obtained a verdict, and they raised the shout of triumph; but their triumph has been, in general terms, the complete destruction among Protestants of theological science, the rejection of all the definitions and distinctions of scholastic theology as unmeaning, the virtual discarding of all the mysteries of faith, and the re-

duction of the whole Christian doctrine to a vague sentiment, or to the few propositions of natural religion which do not rise above the level of the vulgar. The people, if made arbiters, will always decide that what transcends their understanding is unintelligible, and that what is unintelligible is false, — non-existent.

The practice of appealing to the people, in controversies which lie out of their province, has a bad effect on the controversialists themselves. In controversies confined to professional audiences, the controversialists are held in check, are forced to be exact in their statements, and close and rigid in their deductions; for the slightest error, they know, will be detected and exposed. But when the controversy is carried on before the people, who know nothing of the subject but what they learn from the controversialists themselves, and have neither the ability nor the patience to follow step by step a long and closely linked argument, the disputants are tempted to indulge in loose statements, misstatements, and sophistications. Before the professional audience, the question must be discussed on its merits, and each party is obliged to seek for, and confine himself to, the truth; but before a popular audience, the parties, knowing that the tribunal is incompetent to decide the question on its merits, are free, so far as exposure is concerned, to seek only a verdict, and, consequently, to hold themselves free to resort to any methods which will secure it. False assertions and false reasoning, if they will weigh with the jury, will answer their purpose as well as truth. One party may detect the falsehood or the sophistry of the other, but what of that? How often have Catholics detected and exposed the falsehoods and sophistries of Protestants! But what has it availed? The Protestant appealed to the people, reasserted his falsehood, reproduced his sophistry, and triumphed.

The practice, also, has a bad effect on the people. It places them in a false position, and makes them judges where they should be learners. It destroys the docility of their dispositions, the loyalty of their hearts, and makes them proud, conceited, arrogant, turbulent, and seditious. It throws them into a state in which there is no good for them, in which Almighty God himself cannot help them, if he respects their free-will, if he does not convert them into machines, and annihilate them as men. We see this in the present state of the Protestant world. The child is hardly breeched before he is wiser than his parents, and regards it as a violation of his natural rights that

he should be required to obey them. The pert youth, with the soft down on his chin, has no idea that he shows any lack of modesty in telling a Webster or a Calhoun that he differs from him in his political views ; or in saying to the most grave and learned divine, " Sir, we differ in opinion, and are not likely to agree." Hodge sits in judgment on the Angel of the Schools, and Goody Jones instructs her minister in the interpretation of Scripture. The pretty miss, hardly in her teens, never once doubts that she has discovered that all mankind have hitherto been wholly in the wrong, and that nobody ever had a clear and comprehensive view of the truth in morals, politics, or religion, till she planted herself on her young instincts, and mastered all things. Sentiment is placed above reason, even by your great Dr. Bushnell ; instinct is declared the great teacher of wisdom, by your greater Emerson, said to be the greatest man in America ; and Alcott and Wordsworth tell you to sit down by the cradle, and look into Baby's eyes, if you would learn the secrets of the universe. It requires no great wisdom to sneer at what transcends our own limited capacity, no great knowledge to reject as non-existent whatever appears not within the circle of our own mole-eyed vision, or to forego all the accumulations of the race, to strip ourselves naked, and to run through the streets of the city calling out to the people to look and see what marvellous progress we have made, how far we have advanced on our predecessors.

But the question is no longer an open one. We may see and deplore the evils of the press or journalism, but it exists, and we must deal with it as a fact, and as a fact which will exist in spite of us. The only question for us is, whether we will use it in the cause of truth, religion, freedom, social order, or suffer it to be used exclusively by radicals and socialists against them. There is no doubt in our mind that the press has done immense harm, by bringing before the public questions which should be discussed only in the schools, by and for those who are to be the teachers of the people, and by whitening literature and science down to the narrow aperture of the vulgar understanding. We cannot help regretting those old times, — those ages of monkish ignorance and superstition, as modern socialists and unbelievers term them, — when science and learning flourished in the schools, and the few who were to teach and govern were well and thoroughly trained for their state, and the people were docile and loyal. But those ages have passed away, never to return. They cannot be recalled,

and we have only to determine and to make the Christian use of what has taken their place. No man of sound sense and respectable scholarship can countenance, for a moment, the modern doctrine of progress, belied by all the monuments of the past ; no man, with any just appreciation of the fact, that we are pilgrims and sojourners here, that this world is not our home, that we are here to secure a good to be possessed only hereafter, can for a moment doubt that we have fallen on evil times, and that there was much in the past the loss of which is to be deeply deplored. Nevertheless, it is not the part of wisdom to waste ourselves in idle regrets for the past, any more than in vain apprehensions for the future. No state is or can be so bad, that we cannot serve God in it, if we will, do our duty, and gain the heaven for which our good Father intended us, — all that is or can be desirable. After all, those glorious old monkish times may not have been so superior, all things considered, to the present, as we and those who think with us sometimes persuade ourselves. All who see no wisdom or piety in cursing the mother that bore them are apt to remember of the past only the good it had which the present needs, and to dwell on those evils which the present has which the past had not. They sometimes thus overlook present good, and forget past evil. The evil we have and the good we have lost are always the things which the most sensibly affect us. But there is seldom a loss on the one hand without a gain on the other. Every age has its peculiar defects and its peculiar merits, and it may be that the absolute superiority of one age over another is far less than is commonly imagined. Perhaps, after all, if we were transported to those old times which we regret, we should find them not more tolerable than we find the present.

All things, not divine, are mutable, and constantly changing under our very eyes. Nothing continues as it was ; nothing will remain as it is. This is the law of this sublunary world, and we cannot abrogate it, if we would. We must submit to it, and the more cheerfully we submit, the better. We need not suppose that every change is an advance, for, in itself considered, every change may be a deterioration. But when one change has been effected, another often becomes necessary, in order to restore or preserve proportion or equilibrium. Institutions which were good in a given state of things, and better than any thing which can take their place, may, in another state of things, in which they are out of proportion, prove useless,

nay, even hurtful. True wisdom then requires them to be changed ; and to change them will be, relatively to the new order of things, an improvement, if you will, a progress, though involving the loss of a good once possessed. Thus, the Church, which, as a divine institution, is invariable and immovable, proposing always the same end, holding the same principles, teaching the same doctrines, offering the same sacrifice, and employing the same agencies, consults always, in her *modes* of acting on the world, in relation to its affairs, the exigencies of time, place, and circumstance. If she did not do so, she would fall, as an active agency, into the past, and fail to accomplish her mission in governing the world and saving souls. To cling to an old mode of acting after it has become superannuated, or to a human institution after it has served its purpose, is as unwise as to seek uncalled-for changes. The Church does not insist upon all the provisions even of the canon law in a missionary country, where many of them are and must be inapplicable, and would only embarrass her missionaries and impede her operations. She does not adopt the same mode of dealing with the civil government that is uncatholic that she does with the one that is Catholic and enacts Catholicity as the law of the land. Matters which were disposed of without direct resort to the Sovereign Pontiffs, while the great Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, or Alexandria retained the Apostolic traditions, were necessarily transferred to Rome when those Patriarchs had fallen into schism or heresy, and Rome alone retained the faith. Changes of this sort do and must take place, as changes in the world around the Church go on. It is hardly necessary to add, that these changes in her modes of acting to meet external changes imply no change in the Church herself, no development of doctrine, and no spirit of compliance with the age. She remains the same, and only changes her policy in so far as it falls within the province of human prudence, — and even this only so as to place herself in the attitude to resist the world more effectually, and to guard the faithful against the new dangers to which the external changes expose them. The spirit of compliance does not belong to the Church, and it is only in the sense antithetical to the one insisted on by the mer of the world, that her children are free to conform to their age. They are to conform to it only in the sense of being always ready to confront it, and to battle against it in the new position it takes up.

In those old times when the people were contented to learn

of their pastors, and to obey their lawful rulers, both in church and state, popular literature was not needed, and could serve no good purpose. Special literature in the schools was needed for those whose office it was to teach or to govern, and was cultivated to an extent far beyond what it is now ; but a general literature, for the great body of the people, was and could be no want of the times. It was enough for the people to be instructed in the elements of Christian doctrine, and the practical duties of their state of life. Any thing more would have done them no good, and might have done them harm. All they needed was to be firm believers in the things necessary to salvation and good practical Christians. To this end they did not need to be speculative philosophers, classical scholars, or profound and learned theologians. Science and literature for amusement, for their own sake, or as a means of keeping people out of mischief, are not wanted, when men have faith in the Gospel, and understand that their sole business in this world is to prepare for another. If people must have amusement, they can always find it in something better than in lying on the sofa after dinner reading the last new novel.

But when those old times passed away, and a new state of things was ushered in, — when the people become indocile, disloyal, restless, — when literature became the *rage*, — when all the passions were stimulated into fearful activity, and all questions, sacred and profane, were wrested from the schools and brought before the multitude, and placed at the mercy of an unenlightened and capricious public opinion, — evidently something more became necessary, and new modes of meeting the enemies of religion indispensable, if the people were not to be abandoned to their own ignorance, conceit, and self-will. Religion must then possess herself of literature, or suffer its influence to be wielded against her. The world had changed ; the enemies of truth and justice appeared in new disguises ; new evils sprung up, and new dangers threatened, not to be met and discomfited on the old battle-ground, and with the old kind of armor. The enemy having changed his tactics and his armor, the Church was obliged to change hers. The amount of instruction in Christian doctrine, the amount of popular intelligence, amply sufficient before, ceased to be adequate, and if not increased, the faithful in large numbers must fall a prey to the artful and designing demagogues, heretics, and infidels lying in wait to seize them. Authority ceased to be respected, law to have any hold on the conscience of the people, and they

could be saved only by being enabled, in some degree, to detect and despise the subtleties and the specious promises of their enemies. While there remained, as in the earlier stages of Protestantism, some degree of modesty, even in the heretical populations, and their chiefs retained some traces of the culture they had received in the old Catholic schools, it was possible to carry on the war through books elaborately written, and proportioned in size to the magnitude of the subjects treated; but now, when the folio has disappeared, the quarto become a scandal, and the octavo a burden, — when there is a great dearth of clergymen, and nobody respects his superior, or is willing to be taught *vivâ voce*, we are forced to resort to the press, to *Journalism*, as our only practicable medium of reaching that public which most needs to be addressed.

Questions of vital importance have come up which cannot be properly discussed from the pulpit, and which can be treated in a popular manner only through a periodical press that can penetrate where the voice of the preacher cannot reach, and the printed volume will not find its way. Whatever opinion, then, we may form of journalism in itself considered, and however obvious the fact, that editors, as such, do not constitute an order in the Christian hierarchy, we must resort to the means of influence left us by the age in its changes, and, subjecting editors to their legitimate superiors, and confining them within proper limits, employ them to diffuse Christian doctrine, and to defend the rights of the Church and the freedom of religion, as well as the social order and the rights of man, or abandon no small portion of the modern world to demagogues, infidels, and heretics, — or, in a word, to the Socialism of the age.

The chief danger to be guarded against, in using the press, is that of confounding it with the Church, and its managers with Divinely commissioned teachers. The modern doctrine of the uncatholic world ascribes to the press most of the attributes which Catholics ascribe to the Church, and claims for editors the authority which we concede only to the pastors whom the Holy Ghost has placed over us. Hence it is that editors, and now and then even Catholic editors, forget their place, and seem to regard themselves as so many sovereign pontiffs commissioned to superintend all the affairs of both church and state, and to dictate to the Pope, the patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and clergy the policy they are to pursue. We have before us a work translated from the French, by the able and

spirited editor of the *London Tablet*, entitled, *How to enslave a Church*, in the preface to which, the translator with great force and earnestness speaks of the necessity of bringing public opinion to bear upon the legitimate pastors and governors of the Church. The worthy man in his zeal forgot that he was appealing from authority to the mob, and adopting the very principle of Protestantism and of the grand heresy of modern times. The press is not at liberty to dictate to the Church or to her officers, or to superintend or supervise her acts. It must act under authority, under the direction of the Church, as her servant, according to her views of what is her service, not as her mistress. It must do her bidding, and have no thought, will, or wish, but hers, — derived from her through legitimate channels. Bearing this in mind, and never forgetting that the press is a mere instrument in the hands of the Church, which she condescends to use for her own purposes of charity to mankind, it may not only be resorted to, but resorted to with great profit to the sacred cause of truth and piety.

This has, evidently, become the conviction of Catholics at home and abroad. Hence, within a few years, a Catholic press has sprung up in our own country, in England and the English Colonies, and, recently, the Bishop of Ivrea, in Piedmont, has established a journal entitled, *Harmony of Religion with Civilization*, with the express sanction of the Holy Father, — the first journal, we are told, ever established in Europe directly by a bishop. But its establishment, the approval of the design by the Holy Father, who pronounces it very opportune at the present time (*consilium hoc temporibus istis valde opportunum*), and the encouragement which has been given to the Catholic press in this country, by our illustrious prelates and the venerable clergy, prove sufficiently that the Church accepts the press, and is willing to use it against the heresy, infidelity, apostasy, and pernicious socialism of our times.

The Catholic press has already acquired no inconsiderable extension among ourselves. Aside from several papers owned and conducted by Catholics, but devoted chiefly to secular matters, such as the *Boston Pilot*, the *Truth-Teller*, the *Nation*, &c., which we do not include in the Catholic press, we have thirteen journals, of which eleven are published once a week, one once a month, and one once in three months; ten in the English language, two in the German, and one in the French. Leaving our Review out of the question, of which it

does not become us to speak, these journals are, in general, conducted with learning, spirit, and ability; and several of them deservedly rank high among the periodicals of the country. In them all, with one or two exceptions, there has been a manifest improvement during the last two or three years. They have assumed a bolder tone, and exhibited a freer and more independent spirit, taken a wider view, and shown a more correct appreciation, of the general characteristics of the age.

Undoubtedly, the Catholic press, with us, has not in every respect met, and does not yet meet, the wants of the age and country. It has had difficulties of no ordinary character to contend with. Laymen, ordinarily, are not the proper persons to conduct a Catholic press, and never, unless they have made special theological studies, or take the precaution to submit what they write or intend to write to some one who has, — and our clergy have been too few in number for the Catholic population of the country, have been necessarily engrossed with the multiplicity of their missionary duties, and have had, after being placed on missions, little time for study, and still less to write for newspapers. That they have been able to do no more need not surprise us; that they have been able to do so much, and to do it so well, is the wonder.

Moreover, the people on whom our journals have had to depend for their support were, for the most part, recent emigrants from foreign countries, and limited in their education and in their means. They came from countries subjected to Protestant or infidel rulers, where their religion was oppressed, and all that power, malice, and ingenuity could do had been done to degrade and brutalize its adherents. They were, as to the majority, firm believers, sincere Christians, honest and hard-working men and women, but they were not profound philosophers or erudite scholars. They knew of their faith all that was necessary to salvation, and understood the practical duties of their state; but they did not understand the Catholic doctrine in all its relations to the several departments of human thought and action, nor did they take enlarged and comprehensive views of the various tendencies or peculiar heresies of the age or country. How should they? It had been as much as they could do to continue to live and to practise the Catholic worship. They could not understand or feel the importance of discussions, however necessary for the age, which were foreign to their habits of thought and sphere of action. They were strangers, exiles from home, and their interests and affections naturally

clustered around the land from which they had been driven. If they took a paper, it was to learn something of the home which they had left beyond the blue waves, of the friends and relatives dear to their memories, still lingering and suffering there ; nothing more natural, nothing more innocent, nothing more honorable to the human heart. The press was obliged to recognize this state of the Catholic population, and to confine itself, in no small degree, to the news and interests of the several foreign countries from which they had emigrated. Beyond these, it could go no farther than to touch upon a few matters connected with the rights and duties of Catholics here, and to repel such attacks upon their religion as in their daily intercourse with non-Catholics they were most exposed to. More than this Catholics did not ask from their journals ; more than this they were not prepared to receive ; and for an editor to to have attempted much more, even if he had had the leisure, would only have lessened the interest of his paper and endangered its existence. While things so remained, it was impossible for our Catholic press to be other than it has been. The individuals amongst us disposed to speak lightly of it, and to complain that it has not assumed a higher tone and broader views, should remember this, and withhold their censures. Instead of finding fault, we should give our hearty thanks to those who, amid so many difficulties and so many discouragements, have labored so successfully to build up for us a Catholic press.

But the position of Catholics in this country has already changed, and is every day changing, for the better. It is still, in many respects, no doubt, "the day of small things." Every thing cannot be done in a moment. The Church was six hundred years in expelling paganism from the old Roman Empire. But all is every day taking a more favorable turn ; our strength is daily increasing, and our population is becoming more compact and homogeneous. We have already a large and intelligent body of Catholics, who look upon this country as their home, and who feel, without forgetting their fatherland, that this is to be the home of their children, and that it is their first duty to make it a *Catholic* home for them. They are finding themselves in easy circumstances, and begin to see that they are no longer mere outcasts, but in a position to take part in the affairs of the country and the great questions of the day. We have now our own colleges and seminaries ; shall soon have our own primary schools, and form a strong, compact, and influential body in the American republic. All this

poses upon us new duties, and developes new wants, literary and social. The state of things with us has evidently changed, and the Catholic press must change, and, in fact, is changing accordingly. It may and it must assume a higher tone, enlarge the range of its discussions, and rise to the exigency of the times.

The salvation of the American republic depends on Catholicity. The principles adopted by Protestants and infidels, if logically developed, can give us nothing but the most ultra Socialism ; yet Catholics, at least many of them, the moment they come out of the sphere of what is immediately of faith, unwittingly adopt these very principles, and sustain in literature and politics premises which, in their legitimate consequences, are hostile, not only to the Church, but to social order and to all natural morality. They mean nothing of all this ; they love their religion, and would not knowingly do or say aught inconsistent with it ; but in proportion as they take part in the political world, they catch the spirit of the age, and that spirit is Socialistic, against which the Holy Father, Pius the Ninth, in his noble Encyclical, has solemnly warned us. What portion of the American population has outdone the nominally Catholic population of our cities, in their enthusiastic admiration of the late infidel and Socialistic revolutions in Europe ? And does not all this prove that the bulk of our Catholic population do not understand the relations of their religion to the great questions of the day, — that they do not understand their religion in its application to politics and social reforms, and, therefore, in these matters, borrow their notions from the world, which seeks, first of all, to crush the Church ? Catholicity can save our republic only by being practised in public as well as in private life, — only by prescribing our public as well as private morals.

Here is a great subject of immediate practical importance, on which our Catholic press may and must speak, if it would not fail in its duty, with a boldness, an energy, and a distinctness it has never yet assumed. On this point, with a few exceptions, it has been feeble and timid, and, apparently, half afraid to grapple with the monster heresy of modern times. Indeed, if a Catholic editor ventures to repeat the words of our Lord, " Seek first the kingdom of God and his justice," and to censure as uncatholic the contrary doctrine, there are not wanting papers, owned and conducted by Catholics, and having a wide influence over the Catholic community, to denounce him, sneer at him, and to hold him up to the contempt

of the Catholic public, and not altogether without success. Here is an evil to be remedied, and in remedying which the Catholic press must unite with one voice, heart, and soul, and speak out as becomes a Catholic press.

The press, to be useful, must understand thoroughly the age and the form of its heresy. The heresy of our times is Socialism, — manifesting itself in indifferentism on the one hand, and in the elevation of the earthly above the heavenly on the other. The press, without intending it, may, and sometimes does, strengthen this heresy. In a particular locality there occurs a particular act of bigotry. The press, in exposing it, declaims against bigotry and intolerance, and thus gives occasion to the inference, that Catholics hold that men have the moral right to be of any religion they choose, and that, if a man is only honest and sincere in his religion, be that religion what it may, it is enough. We have heard Catholics actually say as much. Foolish men allege that the Church is hostile to liberty. A Catholic editor feels that he must repel the charge; and, in doing so, gives occasion to the inference, that the Church approves of liberty not merely in its true sense, but in the false sense in which it is understood by her enemies. A miserable demagogue alleges that she is anti-democratic; an inconsiderate Catholic, full at once of Catholic and democratic zeal, undertakes to prove the contrary; not perceiving, that, by entertaining such an objection, he raises politics above religion, and subjects, in principle, the Church to the state. Another asserts that the Church does not favor the movements for Social Reform. Forthwith Catholics come out and propose *an alliance* between the Church and Socialism, that is, an alliance of the Church with the peculiar heresy of the age, — a heresy which is the *résumé* of all the heresies which have been from the time of Cerinthus down to our time. All these blunders we have seen during the last four years in Catholic publications at home and abroad, and the consequences may be read in the treatment the Church now receives in every European country. The universal persecution of which the Church is now the object is all owing to Catholics who failed to detect and denounce the heresy when it first began to creep in, and to stand firm to the principles of their own holy religion. Their own cowardice and shameful compromise with error have brought down upon them the chastisements of Almighty God. If Catholics in England had not been steeped in worldliness and been rank cowards, Henry the Eighth could never have

involved them in schism, and Elizabeth could never have founded the present Anglican Church. To find the proof of it, we need but look to Ireland, to Irish Catholics, who, while they feared God, feared nothing else. There is no sense or propriety in declaiming against those outside of the Church. They are of their father, the Devil, and his works they will do. What else should we expect? The fault to be deplored and remedied is in Catholics themselves. If they abuse the gifts of Heaven, they must expect them to be withdrawn.

Socialism, the legitimate consequence, not of republicanism as understood by our American fathers and incorporated into our American constitutions, but of modern *progressive*, philosophical, or radical democracy, such as has led to the French Revolution, such as is seeking to triumph in Germany, is the great question of the day, and a question in the discussion of which Catholics in this country, as well as elsewhere, must take part. It has found its way here; it is playing an important part in our politics; it is undermining our free institutions; and there is no power on earth but Catholicity that can arrest it. Nothing else furnishes the principles from which it can be logically refuted. The whole uncatholic world would embrace it, if it had only the courage to be consistent, as we proved, over and over again, when we had the misfortune, the sin, and shame of being ourselves a Socialist. Many denounced us then, but no man not a Catholic did or could refute us. No advocate of the late French Revolution approaches to a refutation of the doctrines of the Red Republicans and the Socialists of France. A thousand voices denounce MM. Cabet and Proudhon, but not one refutes them. They only draw the conclusion for which the moderate Republicans provide the premises. It is only from the high stand-point of Catholicity that any man has or can have a word to say against that terrible Socialism which sweeps away the Church, the state, the family, property, and reduces all men to a dead level, and a level with the beasts that perish. On Catholics in Europe and on Catholics in America is devolved the task of resisting and overcoming, by the grace of God, this monster. Opposition to it from any other quarter is an inconsequence, a fallacy. Our Catholic press does not seem to us to have felt the full importance of this subject. Mere political changes are of comparative indifference; the Church can co-exist with any form of government, but she cannot coexist with Socialism. The two forces are inherently antagonistical, and one can exist only by the destruction of the other. There can

be no *transaction*, no compromise between them. The one is Christ, the other is Antichrist.

We urge this point, because we feel that it is one on which Catholics, as well as others, need enlightening. Many of the questions which come up are new, and can be decided only in the light of general principles. The application of Catholic principles to social and political questions, in the new forms in which modern society brings them up, is hardly better understood by the great body of the Catholic laity than by non-Catholics themselves. They know that in all matters they are to act honestly, conscientiously; but beyond this they have received very little, if any, direct instruction. But now, when all political and social affairs devolve on the people at large, this is not enough. Popular instruction must enlarge its sphere, and a portion of that knowledge which was formerly necessary only for teachers and rulers must now be diffused through the great body of the people; and to do this seems to us to be peculiarly the province of the Catholic press. No doubt a clamor will be raised, no doubt all manner of charges will be made, and good timid souls will tremble, if the press venture to speak out distinctly, firmly, boldly, the truth as enlightened Catholics do and must hold it; but what of that? Who cares for clamors and false charges? Who is a coward? Who is afraid to live or die for Catholic truth? Who so base as to take counsel of his fears? Let the timid quake, let the false heart denounce, let wicked men and devils rage. What if they do? Put on the whole armour of God, and fear nothing. If you are for God, is not God for you? and who is so silly as to suppose, if God is for him, that any thing can be against him? Out with the truth, out with the precise truth needed by this age, and shame the devils back to their den. Have ye not the old saints and martyrs for an example, and for advocates and protectors? Had they heeded clamors, and outcries, and the fears of the timid, the terrors of the cowardly, think ye they would ever have conquered the world, and made the heathen the possession of their King?

We know that the press cannot take its proper stand without loss of popularity, and that a press that wants popularity can receive but a feeble support. This is one of the evils to which the press is always exposed, and why it can never be so efficient an instrument for good as men suppose. The popularity of a paper is in an inverse ratio to its worth. It is popular by virtue of appealing to popular passion or prejudice,

by encouraging popular tendencies, falling in with the spirit of the people or the age, — the very things it should resist. We know this very well; but still we believe that this evil is less among Catholics, or more easily overcome among them, than among others, for they have faith and conscience. And we also believe that there is already a body of Catholics in this country, of right feelings and views, numerous enough to sustain a truly Catholic press, adapted to the real wants of the times. Catholics are not strangers to deeds of charity, and there are many who have means, and who, we doubt not, have the will, to sustain a press beyond the subscription to a single copy for themselves individually. Let the journal take a high stand, be conducted with energy and ability, on true Catholic principles, and we will not believe that Catholics will suffer it to languish.

We know perfectly well that the press cannot with us assume its proper rank without much labor and sacrifice, and not at all, unless its support is looked upon as a religious duty, and men undertake to sustain it for God's sake. But in these times and in this country, we hazard nothing in saying that the support of the *Catholic* press is a religious duty, a duty to our God and to our neighbour. It is an act of spiritual charity, which, if we love God, we shall feel it not only our duty, but our pleasure, to perform. If the press has, as we have endeavoured to prove, become in these times an indispensable or even a useful instrument in the hands of Catholics for the defence of religion, the doctrines and rights of the Church, and even of social order and natural morality, it is the duty of Catholics to support it to the full extent of its wants and their means. Suppose this Catholic may not want this or that journal for himself personally. What then? Has he means? can he afford to take it and pay for it? Let him do it, then. It will help sustain the journal for those who do need it, and perhaps his own family may find an advantage in it, if not to-day, at least to-morrow. The volumes of *The Catholic Magazine* or of our *Quarterly Review* will have a value next year as well as this, and we may say nearly as much of even any weekly journal, well conducted, on truly Catholic principles, like *The Freeman's Journal*, *The Pittsburg Catholic*, or the *Propagateur Catholique*, to mention no more. It is of great importance to us as Catholics, as American citizens, that we have such journals in the country. We want a quarterly review, for the more elaborate and scientific discussion of the great questions which come up; we want also a monthly magazine, for that

class of readers who have not the leisure to master the elaborate discussions of the quarterly, — supposing the quarterly to be properly conducted, — and who yet want something more solid and of more permanent interest than the weekly journal ; we want the weekly journals in all parts of the country, for the whole body of the Catholic community, to keep them informed of what is passing at home and abroad, and to direct them in forming their judgments of passing events. These three classes of publications, each in its sphere, are all wanted, and one as much as another. The only rivalry there can be between them is as to which shall most efficiently serve the cause of Catholicity. Catholics should feel that it is a religious duty to support them all, and even when they do not always see the soundness of the views on various questions which one or another of them may from time to time put forth. No editor of a *Catholic* journal speaks out of his own head, but, if not a doctor himself, takes care to submit to the supervision and direction of one who is. If his journal puts forth an unpopular doctrine, the Catholic reader may in general be sure that it has been done not inconsiderately, but only because it is Catholic doctrine, or implied by Catholic doctrine, and cannot be lost sight of without detriment to Catholic life. If you ever distrust a Catholic journal at all, if published with the approbation of the ordinary, distrust it when you find it falling in with the popular doctrines of the day, and confirming the public in their prejudices or their fallacies. We make no personal complaints ; we have been treated by the Catholic public with a kindness, an indulgence, which goes to our heart, and makes us feel how unworthy we are to fill the post we occupy ; but we cannot help thinking that Catholics do not generally feel as they should the importance, nay, the obligation, to support a *Catholic* press, and all the more earnestly and perseveringly, the more indisposed it is to appeal to popular prejudices, and to flatter popular passions.

The press may itself do not a little to promote right views and feelings in the Catholic population on this point. The principle of the Catholic press must always be different from that of the Protestant or infidel press. The non-Catholic press proceeds on the principle, that the people are the jury, and that editors are simply advocates addressing them. It seeks simply to obtain from the people a verdict in favor of its client. The Catholic press proceeds on the principle, that it has nothing to do but to make known to the people the judgment of the court, that is, of the Church, to explain it to the people, and to in-

duce them to accept and conform to it. The Catholic press is and should be simply the organ of authority, and never is and never can be the organ of the people, — a popular tribune. A socialist like Horace Greeley of New York may call his journal *The Tribune*; it is in character, for the people are his church, and Humanity is his god; but a *Catholic Tribune* would be a contradiction in terms. Catholic editors never lose sight of this, and, since they must always make it a point to speak under instruction, save on those points where authority leaves them free, they should labor to form their public accordingly, and to correct that tendency, everywhere so strong, to reject as unsound whatever is unpopular, that is, to substitute the judgment of the taught for the judgment of the teacher.

The press must also strengthen itself and extend its influence by its unanimity. In matters expressly of faith, all our journals of course agree; but in other matters it cannot be denied that there has been neither that unanimity nor that mutual good feeling which is so necessary to be maintained. Nearly all our journals are sufficiently courteous towards "our separated brethren," but some of them show a singular want of courtesy, when they have occasion to express their differences from one another. There is no necessity for this. There is no wisdom or piety in vituperation, in personal abuse, in one editor calling another hard names, or in saying things which must wound his feelings. If one journal falls into an error, another has, no doubt, the right to expose it; or if one advances something which another judges to be wrong, the latter may give his views in opposition, freely, and with all the strength of argument he can command; but this he may do, and ought to do, without passion, without personal abuse, and with perfect courtesy and respect towards the journal judged to be in error. Generally speaking, we have ourselves received nothing but praise from the Catholic press, but only one instance has come to our knowledge in which a Catholic, or a nominally Catholic, paper has expressed a dissent from our views on a given subject in a courteous tone, or without a sneer. Now this is wrong. If the error is not of sufficient importance to deserve a grave and candid refutation, it deserves no notice at all. Cobbett's style of writing is hardly the one to be cultivated by Catholic editors, even when carrying on a controversy with those without, — certainly not when carrying on one with those within. In replying to those out of the Church more latitude is of course allowable, for their good faith is never to be presumed; but in contro-

verting a Catholic editor's statement we must always presume good faith, and that he is ready to correct any error into which he may have fallen the moment it is clearly and distinctly pointed out to him. We have enemies enough elsewhere, without making enemies of one another. We do not hold ourselves infallible, and we recognize the perfect right of others to differ from us ; but we do insist that the journal that arraigns what we publish is bound to give its reasons. Simply to object to an article, to say it is *captious*, or not sound, without pointing out what is regarded as captious or unsound, and wherefore it is so regarded, is a want of editorial justice. No professedly Catholic paper should be *cried down* until it has given conclusive evidence that it is hostile to religion, and will not amend its errors ; till then, we are free only to *reason* it down.

We have dwelt on this point because it is important, and because the several Catholic journals, embarked as they are in the same cause, should have a good mutual understanding, and, if they must occasionally rebuke one another, should do it in a truly fraternal spirit, so as to lead to the correction of the error, without any loss of mutual good feeling and affection. There need ~~be~~ and should be no jealousy one of another. There is ample room for all the journals we have ; all are wanted ; not one of them can be spared ; and instead of one interfering with another, they may all be serviceable each to the others. None of them, we trust, have pecuniary gain, or the fame of their editors, for their primary object. They are all established for the good of the Catholic cause, and no one has or can have any other ambition than to serve it as effectually as may be in its power. Let each rejoice, then, in the others' prosperity, and do what it can to promote it.

It is clear from what we have said that the Catholic press has to make its way against the popular current, and must often take unpopular views of the great questions which come up. It is highly necessary that we all understand this, and that, when one journal does this, the others should be ready to second it, and never leave it to fight its battles single-handed. The instant and hearty coöperation of the whole press adds greatly to its power and efficiency. But this is a point on which we need not enlarge, because, in the main, on this head there is not much ground of complaint. And, indeed, excepting the want of personal courtesy and kind feeling between editors who chance to differ on certain questions, in stating what the Catholic press should be, we are only stating what the Catholic

press proper, excluding the papers excluded some pages back, has already become, or, as rapidly as circumstances permit, is already becoming. *The Catholic Magazine* is an excellent periodical, and fills its place well ; *The Pittsburg Catholic* is a journal conducted with great energy and ability, with true Catholic courage, and with a full appreciation of the age and country ; and we may say the same of the New York *Freeman's Journal*, which bids fair to become the model of a Catholic newspaper, and which is already superior, in our judgment, to *The London Tablet*, — at least in the fact that it keeps within its legitimate sphere, and does not assume a sort of episcopacy over the Pope, bishops, and clergy, as if it devolved on it to see that they discharged their duties properly.

The class of papers which we have not included in the Catholic press may also do great service. They are devoted chiefly to Irish interests, but that is a recommendation ; for nothing that can be done here can more effectually serve Ireland than the elevation and independence of our Irish population. These papers, if judiciously conducted, may be of immense service, not only to the Irish population, but to the whole people of the United States. The fault we find with these papers is, that they take their political and social principles from the age, instead of Catholicity, and, directly or indirectly, favor the socialistic or radical tendencies of our times. Espartero, Ledru Rollin, Mazzini, and Herr Hecker have found defenders or eulogists in the columns of *The Boston Pilot*. It is not the Irish feeling or devotion to Irish interests of these papers that offends us, for we will go as far to serve Ireland as will the Irish themselves, but their radical or socialistic tendency, of which their conductors seem to be wholly unconscious. Their editors accept and follow that spirit of the age which the Church does and must resist, for it is antichristian. No doubt, they believe that they are following no spirit not perfectly compatible with their religion. No doubt, they suppose that their religion leaves them free to adopt any views of man and society in regard to this world they please. We do not believe that one of them would knowingly, intentionally, do aught to injure the cause of religion ; but they do not know what spirit they are of ; they do not see that the spirit they are following is the spirit of the world, — that spirit which places the earthly above the heavenly, — and that the principles they adopt, and which they find everywhere taken for granted in the books and journals they read, if carried out, would overthrow all relig-

ion, all morality, all society. They are popular writers, full of noble and generous impulses, and well fitted in these times to draw the multitude after them. Let them but defer to authority, let them take their politics from the approved doctors of the Church, and their views of society from Catholic theology, study their religion in its relations to society, and remember that our condition in this world can be really ameliorated only in proportion as we seek heaven and live for God, and they will render an essential service to their countrymen and ours. They would then be a noble auxiliary to the Catholic press, and would exert a salutary influence where that does not and cannot penetrate. We want a secular press. We want just such journals as these might be, just as much as we want any others. May we not hope that the developments of the revolutionary and socialistic spirit in Europe, the terrible evils to religion they bring in their train, the present situation of the Church, — opposed everywhere, her rights disregarded and trampled on, the liberty of teaching denied her, her religious driven from their homes, her priests assassinated, her bishops exiled, imprisoned, or hung, and all the sympathy of the world, even in nations professedly Catholic, if we except Ireland, given to the party that persecutes her, — will not be without effect on these secular editors, induce them to review their principles, to reëxamine them in the light of the true Catholic doctrine, and finally bring them into line with the Catholic press, to do valiant battle on the same side, against the same enemies, and for the same glorious but unpopular cause? In these times, all that is true-hearted and chivalric should rush to the defence of the Church, without which there is no salvation, no moral or social well-being. Can any one who calls the blessed old Church of God his mother fail to see that his place is on the side of authority against the anarchical doctrines of the day, and that there is no hope for any country but in the freedom and independence of the Church, and through her ministry?

But we have spun out our remarks to a far greater extent than we intended. We have spoken as one of the editorial corps to our brethren, to interchange our views with them, not to dictate to them the course they ought to pursue, for we have no disposition and no right to dictate. We have only thrown out our views, and endeavoured to justify them by solid reasons. We have spoken not for our brethren of the press so much as for the public, who seem to us not to appreciate properly the importance of the Catholic press, nor to understand precisely

the difficulties it has to contend with, what they ought to expect from it, or what is their duty in reference to it. They seem to us too remiss in supporting it, and too ready to find fault with it whenever it does not happen to countenance their momentary crotchets. To our brethren of the Catholic press we return our cordial thanks for the kindness they have shown us, and beg them to pardon us if in any respect we have violated in their regard the principles we have insisted upon in the present article. It is not every one who "recks his own rede," or practises what he preaches, and we are not exempt from the common infirmities of our race. We mean never to disfigure our pages with any other severity than that of reason, and if we ever do, it is unintentionally and unconsciously.

We have insisted earnestly upon the importance of the press, but we have wished to be understood as insisting upon its importance only in its sphere, and as controlled and used by the Church as an auxiliary to her other modes of operation. We want the press free, independent, as it regards the people and secular authority; but as regards the Church, free only to do her bidding. We do not want it to exist as an independent institution, a sort of lay episcopacy. Doing the bidding of the Church, it can do no harm, but may do much good. Nevertheless, let us never forget that the great work itself we want done is, after all, done not by men, but by God himself, using or not using men, as seems to him good, and therefore that always our most effectual working will be prayer to him that he will be pleased himself to work. A single prayer offered in secret to Almighty God, by some devout soul, unknown to the world, shall effect more than our most elaborate articles or brilliant and stirring editorials. God loves the simple and humble, and will do any thing for them. The times are fearful; the dangers are thick and threatening. Let us, therefore, betake ourselves to prayer, as the surest and speediest remedy.

ART. II. — *Hawkstone: a Tale of and for England in 184—*. Fifth American Edition. New York. 1848. 2 vols.

THIS is an Anglican novel, which was published in England early in 1845, and which has passed through five editions in

this country since 1847. We are told that it produced no slight sensation among the English, and we presume it has been well received among ourselves by that class of our community who are fond of saying, "We are Catholics, but not *Roman* Catholics." The author's name we do not know, or, if we ever knew, have forgotten. He is said to be a distinguished member of the Oxford school, and he is evidently a man of some cultivation and fair natural ability. He has a satirical vein and a heartiness in his hatred, which, in the absence of nobler qualities, impart occasionally an interest to his pages ; but as a writer he wants simplicity, ease, sprightliness, and grace. In a few instances he produces a tolerable melodramatic effect, but his power over the human heart does not appear to be great. He seldom touches the springs of deep and genuine feeling. His characters strike us as drawn from preceding works of fiction, and they want originality, life, and naturalness, — are, in general, monsters, blocks, or mere shadows. He might, perhaps, write a passable essay or article for a magazine in favor of Oxfordism, and against Romanism, or Evangelicalism, but he is ill fitted to write a novel pleasing to such as do not happen to be chiefly interested in the religious controversies he carries on.

Hawkstone belongs to the class of novels termed religious, and was principally designed to arrest the tendency to Catholicism so apparent in the Oxford movement for several years prior to the happy conversion of Mr. Newman and a large number of his distinguished friends. We suppose every body has heard of the Oxford movement, of Tractarianism, or Puseyism, but it is possible that every body has not perfectly comprehended it. Many Protestants were frightened out of their propriety by it, and many Catholics thought they saw in it the indication that the day of England's return to the faith and unity of the Church drew near ; but both Catholics and Protestants seem to have beheld it through a magnifying medium. It was in no sense the result of a Catholic tendency among Anglicans ; its motive was not, as some have thought, to Catholicize the Establishment, and prepare the way for its return to our communion ; and England's conversion, we fear, is still a far distant event. England will never return to the Church till she is humbled, till her English pride is broken, and she feels and is willing to acknowledge her own insufficiency for herself. She must be severely chastised, and suffer terrible reverses and calamities, before she will seek the God on whom in her pride and wantonness she turned her back. Nevertheless, the Oxford move-

ment was more important than we ourselves considered it, and Almighty God in his mercy has brought a good out of it which we did not anticipate.

The motive of the Oxford movement was, not to revive Catholicity in England, but to resist its revival, to guard against the consequences of its revival, and to save the Anglican Establishment, whose very existence was threatened by the well-known Act of Catholic Emancipation. That act, passed in 1829, went farther than to relieve Catholics of their political and civil disabilities ; it involved a change, not merely in the policy of the English government, but in the constitution of the English state. The constitution of England, as modified by Protestantism, made the English state and the English Church commensurate one with the other. The sovereign people was restricted to the members of the church established by law. Catholics and Dissenters might or might not be tolerated, but, as such, they were excluded from the state, and could have no representation in the government. The state was Protestant Episcopal, and existed only for Protestant Episcopalians. But when Dissenters, and especially Catholics, were freed from their disabilities, and admitted into the state, as constituent elements of the political body, all this was changed ; the state ceased to have a profession of faith, to be Protestant Episcopal, and, as the state, had no longer any religion at all, except Christianity in that vague sense in which it includes alike all professedly Christian denominations. Its subjects were free to adopt any religion they pleased, and the several religions they might adopt, if nominally Christian, were all equal before it.

From that moment the Anglican Establishment became an anomaly in the British constitution, and one which the ordinary course of events must inevitably sweep away. It ceased to be the *national* religion, the religion of the sovereign people, and there was a manifest inconsistency, to say the least, in requiring the sovereign people to support it. As long as it was the religion of the state, the state might sustain it ; but when it was no longer such religion, the state could not support it as a state religion, without being guilty of a practical lie. Moreover, where would be found in the state the disposition or the power to support it ? Dissenters hated it, and were doing their best to destroy it. Could men be expected as members of the state to sustain an establishment to which as individuals they were conscientiously opposed, and on which they were con-

tinually making war? Would Catholics legislate for the preservation of an Establishment which they believed to be schismatical and heretical, which had persecuted their ancestors, slaughtered their priests, and which was plethoric with the wealth robbed from their Church? If, combined with Dissenters, they had already become strong enough to compel the state, in spite of the Established Church, to admit them into the bosom of the sovereign or ruling people, how long would it be before they would be able to compel it to abolish the Establishment itself? *

Nor was this all. The state had the legal right to abolish the Establishment. It could refuse to support it, on the ground that it was no longer the Church of England, that is, of the new political England, created by the Act of Catholic Emancipation. But it could also do it on the ground that it was its own creation, and therefore subject to its authority. The civil power had created it, and given it its commission, and was therefore competent to revoke its commission, and to unmake as it had made it. For the civil government to destroy it, to blot it out entirely, required the assumption of no principle not necessarily admitted by the Establishment itself, — the violation of no principle either of the old or the new constitution, whether political or ecclesiastical. Of this the government seemed to be perfectly well aware. When, therefore, a reforming government, on the heels of Catholic emancipation, proposed the suppression of certain Irish sees, the friends of the Establishment felt that their worst fears were about to be realized. The

* In this we see the far-reaching foresight of the illustrious O'Connell, and the claims he has to the lasting gratitude of his countrymen. The Catholic Emancipation Act, which was more due to him than to any other man, is the great political event of modern times. It must prove in its operation the destruction of the Anglican Establishment, and the liberation of Ireland. Irish patriots have gained by it the means of working out the freedom of their country. Let them now follow the recommendation of the Holy Father, establish an Irish Catholic university worthy the name, raise up an army of thoroughly disciplined scholars and statesmen, and throw into Parliament a hundred members every way a match for any other hundred members of Parliament, and they will not long have to seek in vain justice to Ireland. We cannot but admire the political sagacity of O'Connell, and, whatever may be our views of his Repeal Movement, we cannot believe it easy to overrate his services to his countrymen. There is great lack of wisdom, as well as base ingratitude, in speaking of him in the disparaging terms adopted of late, by some young patriots, who are no more in comparison with him than a farthing candle is to the luminary of the heavens.

suppression of certain Irish sees might be only the prelude to the suppression of the entire Establishment in Ireland, and its entire suppression in Ireland only a prelude to its entire suppression in England and the Colonies. All this became tolerably clear to Oxford men. It was a moment of peril. What was to be done? The aim of the Oxford movement was to meet the danger here implied.

Two facts were certain : — 1. The English Church was bound hand and foot by the state ; and, 2. No inconsiderable number of her nominal members had little regard for her as an establishment, and no belief in her necessity as the medium of salvation. To arrest the policy threatened by the government, and to save the English Church, two things, then, were clearly necessary : — 1. To emancipate her from her thralldom to the temporal power ; and, 2. To stir up the zeal and augment the fervor of her members. But the former was possible only by asserting the Apostolical origin and commission of the Church, and the latter only by reviving the forgotten doctrine of the Sacraments, which makes them indispensable to salvation ; — two undeniably Catholic doctrines, always held and insisted upon by the Catholic Church. The Oxford men, therefore, accepted these two doctrines, and labored to bring out and establish them as genuine Anglican doctrines. But they soon saw that these doctrines could not be asserted without condemning the principles of the Protestant Reformation, and that the principles of the Reformation could not be condemned without exonerating the Roman Catholic Church from the charges the Reformers had brought against her. But if that Church was exonerated from those charges, and the Reformation was condemned in its principles, it was clear that the English Church was in schism, perhaps in heresy, and no Christian Church at all. Here was an unlooked-for conclusion, — a discovery which disconcerted them, and threatened to defeat them altogether. What was to be done with it? Here was a new and most serious difficulty.

The Oxford men, on making this discovery, divided into three classes : — 1. Those who were and would be Protestants, let come what might ; 2. Those who would save the Establishment at all hazards ; and, 3. Those who would save the Establishment, if possible, but yet not at the expense of truth and consistency. The first of these, seeing very clearly where the movement was tending, and regarding Dissent as a less evil than Catholicity, abandoned the movement altogether, and lapsed

into Low Churchism, Evangelicalism, or Rationalism ; the second, caring little for logical consistency, and having great confidence in the ignorance, the prejudice, and the unreason of the people, boldly asserted, in spite of the obvious fact, that a distinction between Catholicity and Romanism is tenable, and stoutly maintained that they might stand where they were ; but the third class, having a deeper sense of religion, and more logical sequence of thought than usual with Oxford men, unable to accept this distinction, believing what was called Romanism was better than Evangelicalism or Rationalism, and seeing no other alternative, preferred marching towards Rome, and giving up entirely the glorious Protestant Reformation, with the whole catalogue of Protestant saints. But they still wished and hoped to save the Establishment. They saw that they must go to Rome, but they would carry the Establishment with them. Hence they devoted themselves with great zeal and energy to bringing out and popularizing in the Establishment "all Roman doctrine," according to the expression of the time, or so much of it as they understood, with the ulterior view, though not distinctly avowed, of uniting their communion with the Roman. Hence the decided Catholic tendency which the Oxford movement appeared for a time to be following, and which so alarmed Protestants and so encouraged Catholics.

The work before us was written in 1844, just as the third class of Oxford men we have described were rapidly coming to the conclusion, that they must abandon the Establishment, and go to Rome, not as a corporate body, but as simple individuals, yet before many of them had actually become reconciled to the Church. The author is an Oxford man of the second class enumerated. His precise object is to induce the other two classes of Oxford men to continue on in the course they at first marked out for themselves, and to arrest the tendency to abandon it in favor either of Evangelicalism or of Catholicity. He wishes and is determined to save the Church of England ; and in order to do so, he sees that he must defend it against three classes of enemies, — the state, the Evangelicals, and the Catholics. To defend it from the state, or to assert its independence of the state, he must assert it to be the Church of Christ, and the Church of England only because the Church of Christ, and thus abandon the old ground, that it is the Church of Christ because it is the Church of England ; to defend it against the Evangelicals, he must assert its catholicity, its Apostolical origin and commission, and revive the Catholic doctrine

of the Sacraments ; and to defend it against the Catholics, he must make it a national church, the Church of England, and the Church of Christ because the Church of England, and conclude the Catholic Church a false church because it differs from it, and does not recognize its mission. He is an Englishman, at least writes in the character of an Englishman. He must, then, have an English God, an English Church, an English faith, an English worship, in a word, an English religion, suitable to an English gentleman. He must, in order to meet this demand, make his church catholic yet national, universal yet insular ; — catholic, that he may assert its independence of the state and condemn Evangelicals ; national, that he may confine it to England, and keep it under the control of Englishmen, or rather, of Oxford men ; — universal, that he may emancipate it from the state and save its revenues ; insular, that he may save it from the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. If national merely, it is subject to the national will, and at the mercy of the state ; if insular merely, it has no authority as a church, is not essential as a medium of salvation, and nothing can be said in its favor against Evangelicalism or Rationalism ; if catholic, it is subject to the Pope, and Oxford men are not the supreme ecclesiastical authority, and can have no commission but as they receive it from Rome. To emancipate the Church from the state in favor of Rome is to come under another authority equally fatal to them ; to emancipate it from the state in favor of Evangelicalism or Rationalism is to lose its revenues ; and what would it be worth without its revenues ? Therefore, it must be asserted as catholic and not catholic, insular and not insular, and the author must boldly maintain that of contraries both may be true.

The author is an Oxford man, and we are, therefore, not to expect any clear and distinct statement of his problems, or any scientific solutions of them. The Oxford man does not usually deal in science, and there is a sort of haze about his understanding that prevents him from seeing things clearly or distinctly. Indeed, were it otherwise, the Oxford man would not be an Oxford man ; he would be a Catholic, or develop into a downright Rationalist. The author leaves his problems to be divined by his readers, and undertakes to solve them by way of examples, — yet not by examples taken from real life, but imagined by him or his predecessors for the occasion. The discussions are carried on by way of dialogue between certain imaginary Anglicans and Catholics, who have no prototypes

either in the Church or the Establishment, and for the most part behind the scene, — the author only occasionally coming forward and reporting, not the arguments, but the result. We are told Mr. Beattie convinced Mr. Villiers of this or of that, that this same Mr. Beattie satisfied Lady Eleanor as to this or that difficulty; but of the process we are left to judge mainly from the imaginary conduct of the imaginary *dramatis personæ*. There is, no doubt, great convenience in this method of managing a controversy; for the author has only to assert that the party intended to be defeated is defeated, then to make him act as if defeated, and his cause is won. There is some ingenuity in an Oxford man, after all.

The most serious difficulty the author encounters is, how to dispose of the Catholic Church. He can get along tolerably well with Evangelicals and that sort of rabble, for he can assert Catholic doctrine and use Catholic arguments against them; but how to dispose of the Catholic Church, how to silence Rome, is the real difficulty. This he must do before he can proceed a single step in defence of his Oxford movement, for an impression has gone abroad that the Oxford movement has a Romanizing tendency; and he must do it, too, without offending those members of the Establishment who really begin to crave something approaching Catholicity. The Catholic Church is in possession. There she stands, to confound every sect and schism. Men out of her communion may talk as they please, but they have a strange, uncomfortable feeling every time they look at her, and would feel altogether more confidence in their own schemes, parties, or associations, and repose much more quietly in their own inventions, if she was not there, always before them, and giving in her calm and majestic tones the lie to their assertions. The Oxford man seems to be really troubled at her presence, and feels that he should breathe much freer, if she were only out of the way. His first care, as his first necessity, is to remove her. He has half gained his cause, if he has dispossessed her. He must invalidate her titles. But how is he to do this? Scientifically he of course is well aware that he cannot do it. But he has discovered a most ingenious and facile method of doing it. He has only to suppose the principal Catholic doctrines, and call them Anglican, then imagine the most absurd and wicked thing he can, and call it Romanism. Having done this, he has only to imagine the two in operation, and by their imaginary effects judge which must be and which cannot be the Church of God. An ingenious device.

Now this is precisely the author's method of disposing of the Church. The Anglicanism of his book he himself confesses, and his American editor confesses for him, has no actual existence, is not the Anglican Church which is or ever has been, but simply what he imagines, perhaps believes, the present Church of England is capable of becoming. It is only an imaginary or ideal Anglicanism. This, in the very outset, concedes that the Church of England is not Catholic. To be Catholic, it must be Catholic in time as well as in space, and must be equally complete and entire at all times. The most the author can say for his Church is, that he believes it is capable of being developed into the Catholic Church. But this can avail him nothing ; for he goes expressly against the doctrine of Development, and devotes several pages of his book to its formal refutation. Indeed, one of his most formidable objections to what he calls Romanism is, that it seeks to defend itself by appealing to the principle of development. If he denies development, he must take his church as it is ; and if he confesses, as he virtually does, that, considered in its actual state, it is not Catholic, he gives up his cause before entering upon his defence. This, we suppose, must be the Oxford way of defending Anglicanism.

On the other hand, his Romanism, if intended to be taken as the doctrine and practice of the Church in communion with the see of Rome, is as imaginary as his Anglo-Catholicism. It may have some reality in Protestantism, but it is a pure fiction when affirmed of Catholics, or, to please the author, of Papists or Jesuits. To prove that *this* Romanism is not Catholicity is not a difficult matter ; but to do so is nothing to his purpose. Both he and his American editor virtually confess that they do not find it actually existing, and that it is only their ideal of Romanism, — that is, what Romanism might become, if logically carried out. But the Roman Catholic Church, her principles and practice, are facts, and must be taken as they actually are, and refuted as such, or not at all. She is no ideal church. She has existed for centuries ; she has been actualized in the world's history, and it is as so actualized that she must be judged, approved, acquitted, or condemned. We have nothing to do with an ideal Catholic Church, with effects which *might* follow, with characters in which her system *might* issue. The question is, What does she actually teach ? What have actually been her effects ? In what characters has her system actually issued ? A church which has subsisted eigh-

teen hundred, or even three hundred years, cannot be judged by what may be imagined to be her legitimate consequences. She has made her experiment, and must be tried by the results actually obtained, not by results which it is believed or imagined, hoped or apprehended, may be obtained. If the Church, as you concede, never has produced the effects you allege, if she never has given birth to such characters as you imagine, then you are estopped. Fact overrides speculation, and even imagination. Your only rational conclusion is, that you have either reasoned illogically, or misapprehended the system itself, — have either assigned it principles which it repudiates, or failed to recognize in it certain principles which it contains, and which limit and modify the action of those you do recognize.

The author's method of testing what he calls Romanism is by exhibiting its effects on character ; and, imagining its effects to be bad, he concludes, at once, against the Catholic Church. He is in this guilty of what logicians term *transitio a genere ad genus*, for his Romanism differs generically from the Roman Catholic Church ; and, moreover, he adopts a principle of reasoning which is rarely safe, and which must at all times be applied with great caution. The Church is not responsible for the abuses of her system. It is always necessary to prove in the outset that the character to be judged has been formed by her system, not in spite of it, and is its legitimate consequence. Doubtless, there are bad men in the Church, as black-hearted villains as you need look for ; but that is nothing to the purpose. Are they the fruits of Catholicity ? Are they obedient sons of the Church ? Do they believe and obey her teaching ? Do they conform to her spirit, and strictly and conscientiously perform their Catholic duties ? If not, she is not responsible for their character. When the author produces a real personage who lives as the Church directs, who really follows out her system in his daily life, and is, nevertheless, a bad man, or not, in an elevated sense, a good man, we will listen to him and agree that he has adduced an argument against our Church which needs a reply. But this he has not done, — has not even attempted to do. The characters by which he attempts to determine the effects of Catholicity, or, as he calls it, the Papal system, are not real, but imaginary, not drawn from history, but from the author's imagination, and are avowedly formed to express merely his views of its logical consequences. What proves that his views are correct ? The facts and presumptions are against him ; for, if correct, he could have found in real

life characters already formed to his hand. It is certainly a singular way to refute a system, this of imagining something which is not it, then imagining characters to express that which is imagined, and finally, from the unseemliness of these imaginary characters, to conclude the wickedness and falsity of the system itself. Such a refutation can, at best, be only *imaginary*.

That the author draws on his imagination for his Romanism, or that of his predecessors, we need not undertake to prove. A bare statement of it will suffice to prove it, for all who are qualified to form an opinion on the subject. According to him, the Catholic system held by us is throughout a system of fraud and chicanery. The Pope, the cardinals, the bishops, the clergy, especially the Jesuits, are leagued together in upholding and extending a gigantic imposition for the sake of attaining universal temporal dominion. They are constantly engaged in contriving and hatching plots and conspiracies against the liberties of nations and the common rights of mankind. Just now, the whole energy of Rome and her minions is directed to the recovery of England, wrested from her tyrannical grasp by those comely saints, Henry VIII. and his daughter Elizabeth. For this, Catholics pour out exhaustless wealth like water. Innumerable emissaries from the Papal court — men of all grades, and of all characters, fit for deeds of lofty virtue and of the most damning villany — swarm over the nation, penetrate into every society, into every nook and corner of the land, worm their way into the confidence of the unsuspecting, cajole the great, terrify the little, and, through the confessional, master the secrets of all, and use them in furtherance of their hellish purpose. No Englishman is safe. There is a universal conspiracy against him. His steps are dogged, his motions are watched and noted; his most secret thoughts are ascertained, and transmitted to the Pope or to the General of the Jesuits. Artful spies surround him; he is besieged with arguments and blandishments; appeals to his senses, his passions, his intellect, his tastes, his imagination; smooth-faced and liberal priests cajole or threaten him; high-toned and crafty Jesuits, whose nights are spent in vigils, prayers, and studies, whose minds are stored with the literature and science of all ages and nations, make themselves his companions, win his heart, and seek to entrap him into Romanism. Worse than all this; if he remains obstinate, the agents employed are punished for their failure, even assassinated before his very eyes,

by order of their master or masters ; he becomes the object of Papal vengeance ; invisible agents swarm around him ; his plans are defeated, his hopes are deceived, his affections severed, his children stolen from him, and brought up in profanity and vice, prepared, at the first opportunity, to cut his throat. Poor man ! there is no safety for him. Let him not dream that he can escape the vengeance of Rome. Artful, designing, learned, accomplished Jesuits, with no principle but obedience to their superiors, ready to pray or to murder, according to the order given, are ever on his track, and, in one disguise or another, lurking near him. Does he go to Italy to display his magnificence, or to enjoy the sunny clime and the treasures of Italian art ? A Jesuit disguised becomes his body-servant, and soon his factotum ; — by his artfulness, his address, his faculty of making himself agreeable and useful, gets the command over him, finds out his secrets, and then refuses to spare him, unless he turns Papist, and bequeathes his estates to the Jesuits.

Not individuals only, but the state, is beleaguered. Emissaries from Rome are in every department. Every Jesuit, every priest, every Irish laborer, is in the conspiracy. Is there a riot or an outbreak in some mining or manufacturing district, — it is the work of the disguised Jesuit, done in obedience to orders from Rome, for the purpose of bringing about a change of ministry. Is some provincial bank, which has been insolvent for years, obliged to stop business, to the ruin of hundreds of honest people, — the same ubiquitous Jesuit is at the bottom, and has done it in order to secure the return of a Liberal and infidel member of Parliament. Is there a change of ministry, a rise or a fall in the stocks, — it is the work of Rome, through her agents, for the embarrassment of the British government.

With a few rare exceptions, these emissaries and agents are all in the secret, understand the purposes of their masters, and are themselves without faith, without conscience, without principle, and utterly reckless. Nevertheless, they keep their oath, are faithful to their trusts, practise the most exact obedience, submit to the severest mortifications, and make the most painful self-sacrifices ; and all to uphold a system of sheer fraud, a mere imposition, which they know to be a mere imposition, and which among themselves they ridicule and despise. What binds them to their superiors ? What insures their fidelity ? What compels them to make these sacrifices ? They are caught and cannot escape. They find themselves leagued with

a band of robbers, and cannot break away without running the most fearful risks. There would be no living for them in Catholic countries, and Protestants, alas ! have no houses of refuge to receive them. Let them falter in their duty, let them in their secret chambers, in the solitude of their own private thoughts, but dream of swerving from their fidelity, and the muffled assassin's dagger shall speedily find its way to their heart. By a system of universal fraud, intrigue, and espionage, the Church establishes her power, and by a system of universal terror she contrives to preserve and even to extend it.

We say nothing which is not warranted by the book before us, and had we space, we could justify by citations every statement we make. This is Romanism, or the Papal system, according to the author of *Hawkstone* ; and this horrible system, he would have his readers understand, is the system which we Catholics embrace and exert ourselves to uphold and extend ! Does he believe this ? Why should he not ? It is, with slight variation, as far as it goes, the old story which Protestants in general, and English Protestants in particular, have been repeating for these three hundred years, and substantially what we may read in any Antipopery book, tract, or newspaper we can take up. It may seem incredible to those who have been always Catholics from their infancy, that any Protestant can believe any thing so absurd ; but Protestants have a liberal share of credulity, and can believe any thing — but the truth.

The whole of this theory of what they call Romanism, the Papal system, or the Jesuitical system, Protestants rest on two assumptions :— 1. The Church holds that the end justifies the means ; and, 2. That by means of the confessional she obtains possession of the secrets of all hearts, and can use them for her own purposes. The Church exists in spite of all opposition ; that is a fact there is no denying. She persists through all the mutations which go on around her, and retains, and from day to day even extends, her influence. As a matter of course, she is a gigantic imposition. Otherwise, Protestantism would be false and criminal. But if an imposition, if a mere human institution, she can extend or even preserve her influence only by human means, — by craft, artifice, and consummate human skill and address. She must be wise, crafty, subtle, and unscrupulous in the selection and employment of her means and agents. This view of the Church the Protestant must take, or concede that she is the Church of God, and thus condemn himself.

The Church certainly subsists, and it is a fact that the counsels of her enemies are often frustrated, and that nations which have disowned her often feel her influence, and unintentionally promote her interests, in a way which to them is strange and incomprehensible. But this theory of her consummate human policy, her craft and address, is far from being borne out by the facts of history. Humanly speaking, her ministers have not always been good ecclesiastical politicians, and have not seldom committed what in the eyes of men are gross blunders. We have been struck, in reading history, with this fact. If ignorance, weakness, false policy, and blunders on the part of Churchmen could have ruined the Church, she would have been ruined and ceased to exist long ages ago. Her whole history proves that she subsists in spite of human policy, and therefore that she is upheld, not by the arm of man, but by the arm of God. But let this pass. We cannot expect Protestants to recognize the facts of history, or to make in view of them the proper induction. Let it be that she is a mere human institution, and therefore a gigantic imposition; still, the means on which she is supposed to depend are altogether inadequate to the acknowledged effect.

The assumption, that the Church holds that the end justifies the means, is unwarranted, a pure, unmitigated falsehood; but let that pass; even if it were not so, it would not meet the exigencies of the case. The principle itself presupposes that the end is good, at least believed to be good, and it is only on that condition that it can have place, or operate. But if our author is to be believed, the Church does not even propose a good end. He, indeed, represents his imaginary Catholics as justifying their conduct on the ground that it is for the good of the *cause*; but, at the same time, he represents them as perfectly aware that the cause itself is bad. They must, then, act, not on the principle that a good end sanctifies the *means*, — the principle supposed, — but on the principle that a *bad* end sanctifies bad means, — that, however detestable the means, if the end is bad, they are justifiable!

Not only is this the representation given of the inferior agents, but of the superiors, of the Pope, and of his supposed master, the General of the Jesuits. If the system be what it is alleged, it has and can have no good end. What good end, indeed, can you suppose? The salvation of men? No, for the Church believes in no salvation, and its ministers are nothing but a set of baptized infidels, without faith and without con-

science. They know their system to be an imposition, and ridicule its pretensions. Of course, then, they cannot believe its maintenance essential or at all necessary for any religious purpose, — certainly not as the medium of salvation ; for, in order to believe that, they must really believe their Church to be the Church of God, which they cannot do, if they know it to be a mere human institution, a mere imposition. What, then, is the good end proposed ? The monopolizing of power ? But this is not an end ; it is only a means to an end. For what end monopolize power ? For mere selfish gratification ? But that is not a good end. Supposing the Church, then, to be what is alleged, supposing her to adopt the principle, that the end justifies the means, that principle cannot avail her ; for, false as that principle is, it can operate only with men who have some faith and some conscience, and where there is an end proposed which is really or apparently good, neither of which is the fact in the case supposed. The Church has, according to the author, only a vicious end, which she seeks by unscrupulous agents who know it to be vicious. Will he explain to us how the larger part of the civilized world can be made to submit to a system vicious both in its ends and in its means, — a system which they do not believe, and which deprives them of all their rights as men ? or how a system so utterly rotten in all its parts can be sustained, by agents still more rotten, in the face of day, and in spite of all the opposition it undeniably encounters ? Is the Oxford man deeply read in philosophy ? Is he remarkably well versed in the secrets of human nature ? False systems may, undoubtedly, be sustained, but only when they propose an end which commends itself to the human heart, and in whose favor conscience can be enlisted ; and only while the adherents retain some persuasion that the systems, though they may be imperfect, are nevertheless, in the main, true and necessary. Satan must disguise himself as an angel of light, nay, must seat himself on the throne of God as God, must deceive, must delude, in order to induce any considerable number of persons to hearken to him or to worship him as God.

The second assumption is no better. It is false to suppose that the secrets of the confessional are or can be disclosed or used as pretended. The confessor, even if permitted to reveal the secrets of the confessional, or to make use of them out of the confessional, which is strictly forbidden, could do it only to a feeble extent, and on rare occasions. How in the world can a confessor who hears ninety or a hundred different confessions

in a single afternoon, and of persons the majority of whom he does not know even by sight or by name, remember each one's confession, and set it down to the proper penitent? When could he find time to record these confessions? And supposing he could do this, and should transmit the records to Rome, who is there in that city to read them all, to make a digest of them,—reduce them to such a compass, that it would be possible, in any practicable length of time, for the Pope or the General of the Jesuits to form even a general idea of their contents? Neither the Pope nor the General can devote more than a certain number of hours a day to mastering the secrets of these confessions from all parts of the globe; and by what conceivable process will you contrive to enable either, in these few hours, to master the daily secrets of the whole world? Yet the hypothesis requires, not only that the priests collect all these secrets, not only that they write them out, and transmit them to Rome, but that the Pope or the General of the Jesuits — the author does not tell us explicitly which — is actually to become acquainted with them, and to shape his policy according to the information he thus acquires. Who but a Protestant could believe this possible, without one of the most stupendous miracles ever recorded?

But pass over this. The confessional does not afford the means of collecting all the secrets of all the world. Protestants and persons not Catholics do not confess to Catholic priests, and therefore nothing more can be known of their secrets with than without the confessional. If Catholics should happen to become acquainted with their secrets, they could not reveal them in the confessional; for they are forbidden to confess any one's secrets, even if they know them, but their own. If they are conscientious, they will not do it; if they are not conscientious, they will not go to confession. The agents and emissaries supposed have neither faith nor conscience, and therefore will not seek the confessional, or, if they should, they would take care to confess nothing seriously to their own disadvantage. Consequently, supposing the worst, it is not possible through the confessional to get at that knowledge of the secrets of mankind, or of the emissaries and agents employed, which is essential to the maintenance of the system of universal terror by which it is pretended Rome is able to keep up her power, and secure the fidelity of her servants.

The author of *Hawkstone* reasons as if every body confessed to Catholic priests, — whereas none but Catholics do it; also,

as if all who pass for Catholics, although they have neither faith nor conscience, go to confession, and that each one not only goes to confession, but even makes a good confession, — whereas none but good Catholics go to confession, for nothing but faith and conscience can carry them there ; or if something else should induce them to go, nothing else could induce them to make a clean breast, that is, what Catholics term a good confession. Evidently, then, supposing the Church to be as bad as our author pretends, the means he alleges are altogether inadequate to give and preserve her power. The causes assumed are inadequate to the effects which are seen and cannot be denied. The Protestant has, no doubt, all the malice requisite to imagine bad causes for these effects, but he suffers his malice to get the better of his discernment. When he takes it upon him to invent a Romanism for us, he should take care to invent causes adequate to its explanation. If Romanism were what he supposes, and dependent for its support on the means he imagines, it could not subsist twenty-four hours. It would instantly be exposed ; nay, *Hawkstone* alone would suffice to annihilate it for ever. Yet *our* Romanism survives, and, we doubt not, will survive for some time to come.

But having in his imaginary way disposed of his imaginary Romanism, or Papal system, the author imagines that he has cleared the field for his Oxfordism, or imaginary Anglicanism. This is the first step. If now he can establish his Oxfordism with as much success as he has had in dispossessing Romanism, he imagines he shall be able to shout his imaginary triumph. His work is now to prove the English Church Catholic. In order to do this, he begins by conceding, nay, proving to our full conviction, that, in its actual state, at least going back ten years from the date of his story, it wants nearly every element of the Church of Christ. It is enslaved to the secular power, and has no faculties of its own ; it has been robbed of its rights and has refused to reclaim them ; it has lost sight of its glorious privileges, its high prerogatives as the Church of God, and suffered them to be denied without a protest ; it has failed to assert the Catholic system, and left by the way large portions of Catholic doctrine ; it has failed to discharge its most obvious and imperious duties as a Christian church, and suffered to grow up under its ministration the most ignorant, vicious, criminal, degraded, and squalidly wretched population to be found in any nation, fostering in the very heart of the empire and threatening its total destruction, without making even an

effort to arrest the terrible evil ; its bishops and priests, though meaning well, perhaps, with rare exceptions, neither understand nor perform their duties as Christian pastors, and as doctors fall into mischievous errors and damnable heresies. We do not doubt it.

But this is nothing against the Church of England. It is rather a proof of her being the true Catholic Church, as distinguished from the Papal Church.

“ ‘ And yet,’ said Villiers, ‘ the Church of England ten years since was at the point of death.’ ”

“ ‘ So,’ replied Beattie, ‘ it seemed to us. Threatened by the people, treacherously protected and corrupted by the state, robbed of her revenues, mutilated in her bishoprics, disorganized and enfeebled in those collegiate bodies which ought to form her greatest strength, her authority neither asserted by herself nor recognized by others, her testimony set aside and supplanted by an empty rationalism, her education emptied of every thing which could give it life and power, her churches deserted, her children running off without a warning voice into every kind of dissent, and the population swelling like a running tide around her, and menacing to swallow her up, like those fabled springs destined to overflow and drown the mortals who forgot to keep them under cover and confined within their proper bounds,— such was the condition of the Church. Who would have dared at that time to prophesy that it should, within ten years, simply by the assertion of its own principles, be more deeply rooted than ever in the affections of its children, more feared than ever by its enemies, more able than ever to take its stand as the guardian of this empire, and to spread out its arm to the most distant continents as the converter of the heathen ? Yet surely this is now true.’ ”

“ ‘ And yet,’ said Villiers, ‘ there must have been some malformation, some secret mischief, which had reduced her to her previous state. Without some radical defect, no church could so have fallen.’ ”

“ ‘ My dear Villiers,’ said Beattie, after a pause, and placing his hands on his friend’s shoulders, ‘ will you endeavour to remain for five minutes in this position, standing upright without moving a single muscle ? ’ ”

“ Villiers stopped (for they were now walking on the terrace in the college gardens), and endeavoured to do so, but found it impossible.

“ ‘ Or,’ continued Beattie, ‘ will you try and walk up to that plane-tree yonder in one straight line without a single divergence ? ’ ”

“ Villiers shook his head.

“ ‘ No,’ said Beattie, ‘ it would be impossible ; for *the law of*

progression, as in human minds, and in individuals as in societies, is a law of continual oscillation. We bend from side to side, wavering at every step ; if weak, falling wholly, not to rise again ; if strong, recovering ourselves by some great effort, and advancing at each fresh struggle with more directness, but never upon this earth without a tendency to vary from the central line. Do not, therefore, measure the weakness of societies by their oscillations, or even by their falls (*for they are human and cannot escape them*), but by their recoveries, — recoveries through their own internal strength, when to common eyes they seemed wholly lost. Look round on all the churches in the world, on all civil societies which history presents, and search if you can find an instance of any human polity recovering itself from oscillations so fearful as those by which the English Church has been shaken at times from her centre. Think what a tremendous shock to all opinions and all institutions was given by the stroke which severed her from the tyranny of Rome. And yet, though she bent for a time beyond her equilibrium, she righted and recovered in her doctrine both the principle of authority and the talisman of an hereditary Catholicism, without which she would long since have been fractured to atoms, like the Protestant communions in Germany. *She was saved here by the arm of the civil power*, which grasped her (roughly, indeed, and tyrannically) when she had shaken off her hold upon the Papacy ; but yet rescued her from falling wholly into that worst anarchy, the government of self-will. That arm itself was then fractured ; and the Church fell to the ground, and to human eyes was utterly destroyed. And yet suffering, and persecution, and martyrdom, only purified and strengthened it ; and it came out of the convulsions of the rebellion stronger than before, — the monarchy supported by the Church, and the Church supported by the monarchy. The Revolution came ; and the monarchy was split from top to bottom. It stood, indeed, and a superficial view might not detect the flaw. But the principle of popular election, however disguised and disclaimed, was admitted into the constitution. And since then the Church has been placed to contend against it, breaking out as it has done in a thousand different forms. She has contended with it under the most difficult circumstances ; her hands tied, her movements restricted, her principles corrupted, her resources curtailed, her operations betrayed by the necessity of recognizing a nominal monarchy, which, in reality, was a democracy. If the monarchy had wholly disappeared, her course would have been plain and her opposition unfettered. But she has fought like a woman defending her house and husband against robbers ; her husband himself being all the time one of their accomplices, and endeavouring to silence and corrupt her. We measure strength,' continued Beattie, 'not by mere exertion, but by exertion against resistance, and under dis-

advantages. Think, in this point of view, on the very existence of the Church of England at this day as all but a miracle.' " — Vol. I. pp. 288 — 291.

Our readers will do well to reperuse this extract, and to take notice that the defence of the Church of England is here expressly based on the assumption, — not concession merely, — that it is a *human* institution, and subject to the law of human progression. Her oscillations are only those of the human mind itself, and it is not possible for her to walk without a tendency to vary from the central line of truth. This we have no doubt is true. But if a human and a variable institution, how can she be the Church of God, the reflex on earth of his own eternal truth and immutability? To assume the Church of England to be human is to deny its divinity, and therefore that it is the Catholic Church. Who but an Oxford man, after this, would attempt to prove her the Church of Christ?

Nevertheless, the author, after having thus conceded away and disproved, in the most satisfactory manner, the Catholicity of his Church, and reduced her to a purely human society, proceeds to prove that she is truly Catholic, and that Anglicans, though not Romanists, are genuine Catholics. But how? What is the Catholic Church? How is it identified with the English Church? Why, the modern Church of Rome is the Catholic Church *plus* the Papacy; consequently the modern Church of Rome *minus* the Papacy is the true Catholic Church. Abstract from the modern Church of Rome the Papacy, the remainder will be the answer to the question, what is the Catholic Church. Now it is certain that the Church of England during one thousand years prior to the Reformation was this same Catholic Church *plus* the Papacy. But the Reformation intended only to throw off the Papacy. Consequently the Church it left, as the present Church of England, was this same Church, *minus* the Papacy, which is the true Catholic Church, and therefore the present Church of England is the true Catholic Church. Q. E. D. It is true, however, that the Reformation in point of fact exceeded its intention, that the Reformers tore away a part of the Catholic system itself; but as the Church of England *intended* to throw off only the Papacy, she is not responsible for what went beyond that intention, and has therefore the right to claim, *minus* the Papacy, the whole Catholic system as her own. She is then, undeniably, the Catholic Church *de jure*, and the moment she revives the whole Catholic system and conforms to it in her practical

teaching, discipline, and worship, she will be it *de facto*. Who, then, dare deny the Catholicity of the Church of England?

This, if we understand it, is the Oxford theory. It is ingenious, profound, and beautiful, and highly creditable to its authors. It settles with great ease the questions which might arise as to what is the true Catholic Church. Rome answers those questions for them, and her authority is good, except so far as she asserts the Papacy. After all, then, Rome serves an important purpose. She keeps the Catholic Church in its integrity, though unhappily obscured by her own additions. Still, as under her additions remains intact the entire Catholic Church, we can learn from her what it is, which we could not do from the Church of England, for she, unhappily, has mutilated it, and lost the greater part of it. The author, therefore, takes frequent occasion to rap his Evangelical brethren over the knuckles, for their vulgar prejudices against Rome, and also, notwithstanding all he says against her, to show her immense superiority over the Anglican Church. It is clear, in his view, that, *minus* the Papacy, Anglicanism wants all that Romanism has, and that Romanism has all that Anglicanism wants. Let England borrow from Rome all that Rome has, *minus* the Papacy, and England will once more be Catholic. Rome, then, unless she undertakes by her own authority to plant her system in England, in derogation of the mission of Anglicanism, is to be respected, and held to be a living branch of the Catholic Church. Really, Oxford men are liberal as well as ingenious, and not at all squeamish, if not themselves interfered with! They have no difficulty in recognizing the Catholicity, out of England, of the very Church which they denounce as a gigantic imposition upon mankind, and which, according to them, is sustained only by a system of universal fraud and terror!

This theory, too, enables the Oxford men to dispose of certain troublesome matters connected with the interference of Henry and Elizabeth in ecclesiastical matters at the time of the separation of their Church from the rest of Christendom. The Church of England does not derive from either Henry or Elizabeth; it is the old Catholic Church of England, the primitive Church, *minus* the Papacy, which had been the Church of England from the time of St. Austin, perhaps from the time of St. Paul. Henry and his daughter Elizabeth were only instruments, — rude instruments, it is true, but such as the times afforded, — in the hands of God, for freeing her from foreign domination and Roman corruption. The Reformers may not

have been saintly men ; they may have had bad motives, and erroneous principles and doctrines. But what then ? Bad Churchmen do not make the Church false or wicked. They had nothing to do with founding the Church of England, or settling its constitution, doctrines, or liturgy. They only disencumbered her of the Papacy, cut away the excrescences or accretions which threatened her existence, in order to enable her to stand forth in her native freedom, purity, simplicity, and majesty, as the Church of God, which she was, and had always been. This was their work. They gave nothing to her ; they simply removed what was not hers, and which was only a let and a hindrance to her. They may, indeed, in their ignorance, their zeal, their error, their rashness, have laid a rude hand on the Church herself, taken away more than they should have done, mutilated, wounded, and left her half dead ; but is she to blame for that ? Is she to be censured because she was so cruelly treated ? Is she to be denied her own because she was unjustly deprived of it ? The Reformers in their rude grasp exceeded their powers, and she cannot be bound by their lawless acts. She has, therefore, the right to disavow them, and to reclaim her own.

All this is no doubt very clever, but we do not precisely understand how the Church of England can be Catholic at all, if not Catholic in fact, — Catholic in her actual character. A Church Catholic *de jure*, and not Catholic *de facto*, passes our understanding. We should suppose a Church ceasing to be Catholic in fact had forfeited whatever rights it once had, and become a schismatical or an heretical body. A man once Catholic, but lapsed into schism or heresy, retains, no doubt, with the blessing of God, the power of becoming a Catholic again, but he can hardly for that be called a Catholic, unless he actually becomes so. As long as the power remains a mere virtuality, unexercised to act, he is no more of a Catholic than if he had it not. Grant that the Church of England was once Catholic, that is nothing, if she is not Catholic now ; grant, also, that she has the power of becoming Catholic once more, and — what we deny — that by reducing to practice principles which she actually holds ; that does not make her Catholic, and she cannot be Catholic, unless she so reduces them, and actualizes that power. As long as she remains as she is, she is only what she is *in actu*, and not being *in actu* Catholic, we should suppose that she cannot be regarded as Catholic at all.

That the Church of England before the Reformation was

Catholic, by virtue of her communion with the centre of unity, we concede, and if she is now identically that same Church, she is Catholic now, we also concede ; but if the identity asserted does not exist, the fact that the old Church in England was Catholic does not make the present Anglican Church Catholic, but the reverse. That identity does not exist, if there is an essential difference between the Church that is and the one that was. That such difference does exist is proved by the admitted fact, that the Anglican Church was mutilated by the Reformers, that she has been subjected to the civil power, has practically rejected large portions of the Catholic system, has neglected essential Catholic doctrines, has embraced doctrinal errors, and sanctioned, tacitly at least, mischievous practices ; nothing of which, in the same sense, can be affirmed of the Church before the Reformation. Under any view of the nature and office of the Church which even Oxford men will take, this must imply an essential difference, and therefore destroy the identity asserted ; and then, confessedly, the Catholicity both *de jure* and *de facto* of the present Anglican Church.

That the Anglican Church, since the change effected by the Reformers, and in spite of it, retains certain principles which imply and demand the Catholic Church for their logical development and practical operation, we do not deny. There is no heresy of which we cannot say as much. Even the Unitarian has principles, which, if logically carried out and reduced to practice, would compel him to seek admission into the Catholic communion ; but he is not, therefore, a Catholic : for he does not so carry out and reduce them, and because he has other principles which he obeys and which are opposed to them and utterly inconsistent with Catholicity. The Church of England may retain in her Book of Common Prayer and other formularies principles which logically imply the Church ; but they give her no title to Catholicity, if they are not logically developed, and made the principles of her actual life, or if along with them she holds and practises another set of principles inconsistent with or diverse from them. To be Catholic she must not only retain all Catholic principles, but she must have no other principles, and she must not only possess the Catholic principles and them only, but she must live them, that is, realize them in her actual life. But it is conceded by the Oxford men themselves, that she does not realize the Catholic principles in her actual life, for they are laboring with all their

might to induce her to do it. Either, then, she realizes no principles, and therefore is only a dead church, living no life at all, or she realizes other than Catholic principles, and is therefore a false church. In either case she is not Catholic.

But giving the Church of England the benefit of development, which our author repudiates, and granting that she retains, as far as they can be retained in formularies, all Catholic principles and Catholic principles only, she is not Catholic, unless she is united in the one Catholic communion, for Catholicity is inconceivable without unity. It is conceded by Oxford men, that valid and legitimate sacraments are essential to the Catholic communion, and their purpose requires them to maintain that their Church is indispensable to salvation, at least in England, because she has valid and legitimate sacraments, and no one else has them. In order to maintain this, they must maintain her Apostolic origin and commission, that is, *ORDERS* and *JURISDICTION*. If, in the change which took place in the convulsions of the sixteenth century, the Church of England lost these, or either of them, she is not, and, without going out of herself, cannot become, Catholic. If she lost orders, that is, valid ordination, she is no church at all, but a mere human society, as our author in fact assumes her to be; if she has lost jurisdiction, she is at best only a schismatical church.

That the Anglican Church, so called, has no valid orders is morally certain, and under the circumstances of the case the negative is to be concluded if the affirmative is not proved, because the perpetual *visibility* of the Church must be asserted. She certainly has none, unless she has received them through Matthew Parker, Queen Elizabeth's Archbishop of Canterbury; and she has not received them through him, unless he himself had been validly consecrated. That he had been was denied by the Catholics at the time, who must have known of his consecration, if he had been consecrated, and who had no interest, as Catholics, in denying it, but rather an interest in affirming it. It was virtually conceded even by members of the Establishment, who certainly would not have failed to assert and prove it, had they been able. The uneasiness of many Anglicans became so great, that the civil authority was obliged to interpose, and attempt to establish it, not by adducing proofs of the fact, but by the royal prerogative, and making it a penal offence to deny it. This was very extraordinary. The queen was a lay person, and had no authority to consecrate or to supply defects; and the fact, that her supposed authority to supply defects was

invoked in the case, is itself a proof of the invalidity of the consecration. If Parker had been consecrated at all, it must have been by her order, and the evidences of the fact must have been within her reach. Why, then, did she not silence the gain-sayers, and calm the uneasiness of her subjects, by producing them, instead of attempting to do it by royal proclamation or act of Parliament? Who will believe, that, if the consecration had taken place, and by her order, she had no means of proving it?

There is no evidence that any valid act of consecration took place, but the Lambeth Register, unknown, at least never produced, till some fifty or sixty years after the pretended event it professes to record, and which, though Dr. Lingard thinks it is genuine, is in all probability, to say the least, a forged document. It is too minute, enters too much into detail, and, as one may say, is too perfect to be genuine. Its not being produced, when needed to repel Bonner's plea that Horn was no bishop, is unexplained. If it existed, its existence must have been known, or could have been ascertained, by those who had an interest in producing it. The fact that they did not produce it is conclusive evidence, either that it did not exist at the time, or was known to be worthless.

But given the genuineness of the Lambeth Register, still there was no valid consecration, unless Barlow, who is said to have been the consecrating bishop, had himself been validly consecrated. That he had been, there is not a particle of evidence, and there is as strong evidence as the nature of the case admits that he had not been. That he had been a bishop elect is conceded, that he had been consecrated is not proved, cannot be proved, and is disproved to a moral certainty.

But passing over this, even conceding Barlow had been validly consecrated, there still was no valid consecration of Parker; for, if consecrated at all, it is conceded that it was according to the Ordinal of Edward VI., which was defective, and obviously did not consecrate to the office of bishop at all, as Anglicans themselves virtually admitted, a hundred years after, by amending it. These facts prove conclusively that Anglicans have no valid orders; therefore that their Establishment has no sacraments; therefore that it is no church at all, and that its pretension to Apostolic succession is imaginary. The Oxford man is, therefore, fully justified in placing it in the category of *human societies*, and assuming it to be subject to the law of human progression.

But granting Anglicans *valid* orders, they have no *legal* orders. They have no mission, no jurisdiction. That their Church has no jurisdiction but what it receives from the civil authority is a well-known and undeniable historical fact, which has been legally established in the recent case of Dr. Hampden, raised to the see of Hereford. But the civil authority cannot give spiritual jurisdiction, for the Church derives her mission from God, not from the state, as the Oxford men themselves assert and must assert, for they seek to emancipate the Church from the state. Consequently, supposing the Church of England to have valid orders, even orthodox doctrine and usages, she is only a schismatical body, and as such diverse from the Catholic Church, and under its anathema.

To us these are serious difficulties in the way of the Oxford theory. The Oxford men are obliged to concede, nay, they assume, that in her actuality their Church is not Catholic, and they assert her Catholicity only on the strength of certain latent principles which they say she retains, in spite of the changes effected by the Reformers, and which they hold can be developed into actual Catholicity. But suppose the principles, suppose them developed, — if she wants valid orders, she is no catholic church; she is, if you will, a body moulded after the Catholic fashion, but a dead body, a mere carcass, without vitality or reproductive energy. And even if she have valid orders, and all Catholic principles and usages, since it is undeniable that she has no jurisdiction, she is only a schismatical church, differing *per genus* from the Catholic, and no more capable of being developed into it than a monkey is of being developed into a man.

But this is not all. The Oxford men tell us that their Church is the identical old Church of England which existed prior to the rise of Protestantism. On this ground and this only do they assert her Catholicity; and they agree that if she is not that identical Church, that if she was instituted by the Reformers, or contemporaneously with them, she is not Catholic. This identity, we have seen, does not exist; but suppose it. The essential attributes of the Church of England must, then, be identical, both before and since the rise of Protestantism. The Oxford men tell us, that, among other things, it is an essential attribute or function of the Catholic Church to teach, and that, in teaching, her authority, under God, is ultimate, supreme. Hence, they repeat, "Hear the Church," and assert the absolute obligation to believe what she teaches. But it is a

well-known fact, historically provable, denied by no one, and conceded by the Anglican Church herself, in her present official teaching, that prior to the Reformation, for a long series of ages at least, the Church of England held and taught that the Papacy is an integral, an essential element of the Catholic system. On what authority, then, do Oxford men exclude the Papacy from that system, and how can they exclude it and still believe the teachings of what they call the Church of England?

Do they reply, that their Church now denies the Papacy, and that they must believe her present instead of her past teaching? Be it so. But if they say this, they must say it on the ground that the authoritative teaching of the Church is always her present teaching, and then they deny to themselves their pretended right of appeal from the modern Church to the primitive, — their only method of even appearing to justify their rejection of the Church of Rome. Moreover, if they give this reply, they concede that their Church teaches at one time one doctrine, and its contradictory doctrine at another. Both doctrines cannot be true. Either, then, their Church taught a false doctrine on the Papacy before the rise of Protestantism, or she teaches a false doctrine now. If she teaches a false doctrine now, the Papacy is included in the Catholic system, and the Oxford men are heretical in rejecting it. If she taught a false doctrine then, as they must hold, she was then a false church, and therefore not Catholic. If not Catholic then, she, by their own confession, is not now, unless a church identically not Catholic is Catholic. If the present is identically the Church of England before the rise of Protestantism, she has undeniably erred, for she has taught contradictory doctrines, and therefore is not Catholic. The Catholic Church cannot err, for she is God's Church, and what she teaches he commands us to believe, — as Oxford men themselves assert, in asserting her authority to teach, — and he cannot command us to believe a false doctrine, since that would be to lie himself, which, if we may credit St. Paul, or even the natural light of reason, is impossible. No church that errs or can err is, then, the Catholic Church; as Anglicans maintain, for they attempt to disprove the Catholicity of our Church by proving that she has erred. The Oxford men, by their own confession, cannot assert the present Catholicity of their Church, unless they assert her identity with the Church in England before the Reformers; and they cannot assert it, if they contend for that identity, for then they must concede that she has erred, either in teaching the Papacy

or in denying it. In no case, then, can they assert that their Church is Catholic, without making God a liar. If not Catholic, she has no authority, and cannot authorize the rejection of the Papacy.

The Anglican Church, assuming the only ground on which Oxford men attempt to defend her Catholicity, has both affirmed and denied the Papacy. Her authority, then, neutralizes itself, is placed in the centre of indifference, and, at best, stands at zero. It can, then, count for nothing. On what authority, then, do the Oxford men assert that the Papacy is no part of the Catholic system? They must, according to their own principles, do it on the authority of the Catholic Church, because they acknowledge that she has authority to teach, and we are to learn from her what we are to believe. Thus, our author expressly maintains, in his attempt to pervert the poor simpleton, Lady Eleanor, to Anglicanism, that we are to hear the Church, and to take our faith from her, and on her authority. The Church is the teacher, and teaches us, instead of our teaching her. Then we must learn what is or is not the Catholic system from her. We cannot assume the Catholic system, and from that conclude the Catholic Church, but must first ascertain the Catholic Church, and then from her conclude the Catholic system. That is, we must take the doctrine from the Church, not the Church from the doctrine. Now, as the Anglican Church, not being Catholic, or having nullified herself by her contradictions, has, as we have seen, no authority, what is, we repeat, the Catholic authority on which the Oxford men exclude the Papacy? The primitive Church, or the Church in primitive ages? No; because they are obliged, as we have seen, in order not to be bound by the teaching of the Church in England before the rise of Protestantism, to maintain that the present teaching of the Catholic Church is always her authoritative teaching, and must be taken as the authoritative declaration of her teaching in all past ages. If they appeal to the Church in primitive times, they condemn themselves, in crediting their Church in what she teaches now, rather than in what they concede she taught before the Reformers.

Again; the primitive Church to which Oxford men appeal either was the Catholic Church or it was not. If it was not, it had no authority to teach, and they gain nothing by the appeal. If it was, it either subsists still, or it does not. If it does not, the Catholic Church has failed, is dead, and its authority has died with it. The authority of a dead

church is only a dead authority, and a dead authority is as no authority at all, and therefore cannot authorize. Consequently, if the Catholic Church is dead, the Oxford men have not and cannot have her authority for saying what is or is not the Catholic system. But if the Catholic Church still subsists, she subsists the identical Church she was in the primitive ages, with the same identical authority, and the same identical doctrine she then had. We say *the same identical doctrine*; for Oxford men deny, as we do, development, and maintain that identity of doctrine is essential to the identity of the Church. Is it not on this ground that they attempt to unchurch the Roman communion? Do they not deny her Catholicity because, as they allege, she has varied her doctrines and corrupted the faith? If, then, the identical Church of the primitive ages, the Catholic Church must teach to-day the identical doctrine she taught then. Then, to appeal from the Catholic Church in the present, supposing her to exist, to the Catholic Church in the past is, — 1. *useless*, for there can be no difference between her present and her past teaching, and he who has her present doctrine has already her primitive doctrine, on the same authority on which the primitive believers had it; 2. *inadmissible*, because the present teaching of the Church is the only possible *Catholic* authority on which we can take her primitive teaching, and to appeal to her past teaching is to appeal from the Church to history, the only authority aside from her own to tell us what was her primitive teaching, which cannot be admitted, for it is agreed that the Catholic system must be taken on the authority of the Church, not on the authority of history; 3. *absurd*, for it denies the authority of the Church and asserts it in the same breath; since the Church appealed from is identically the Church appealed to, and to appeal from the Church is to deny her authority, while to appeal to the Church is to assert it.

Oxford men must either assert the Catholic Church as a fact, or deny it. If they assert it as a fact, if they acknowledge that there ever was a Catholic Church at all, they must concede her continuous existence in time, and therefore her present existence. Catholicity is inconceivable without unity, and Catholic unity is inconceivable without uninterrupted chronic continuance, or unity in time. The Church must be one and identical in time and space, or it is not and cannot be Catholic. It is agreed that an essential attribute of the Church is to teach, and to teach with supreme authority. Then at every moment

of time, from the first down to us, she must have *in actu* the supreme authority to teach. Then at every moment the paramount obligation to hear her and to believe what she teaches at that moment does and must subsist. On no other condition can a Catholic Church with supreme authority to teach be conceived. Appeals from her present to her past teaching, then, can never be allowed, because her present authority is supreme, and the obligation to believe her present teaching paramount. We may appeal to history, to the records of her past teaching, *against* those who allege that she has changed her doctrines, or does not maintain identity of doctrine, but never from her present teaching, in order to remind her of what she ought to teach, or to ascertain for ourselves what we are to believe; for this would deny her present authority, and therefore her past authority and existence. The Oxford men must, then, abandon their appeal to the primitive Church, and take the Catholic system from the present Catholic Church, or deny that there is or ever was a Catholic Church. But if they do the latter, they then give up all their pretensions to be Catholics. If there is no Catholic Church, there is no Catholic system to be received or rejected, to be revived or retained. Here, then, they are. If they deny the Catholic Church, all their talk about Catholicity is nonsense; if they assert her existence, they must take the Catholic system from her as she now teaches it, and hold, that, as she now teaches it, she has always taught it, and will teach it, till the consummation of the world.

But not being allowed to appeal from the Catholic Church in the present to the Catholic Church in the past, on what authority, we ask once more, do the Oxford men exclude the Papacy, and declare it repugnant to the Catholic system? On the authority of the Greek Church? No; because the Greek Church is in the predicament of their own, she having in the course of her history both received the Papacy and rejected it. On the authority of the Church of Rome? No; for she asserts the Papacy as an essential element of the Catholic system, and it is for this reason that they condemn her. On the authority of the Holy Scriptures? No; for they reject private interpretation, and maintain that the Holy Scriptures are to be understood as interpreted by the Catholic Church. On the authority of self-will? No; for that they hold is the principle of Dissent, and they have no mercy for Dissenters. On the authority of the state? No; for they seek to free the Church from her dependence on the

state, which they could not consistently do, if they held that the state has authority to define her doctrines. On what authority, then? On none? How know they, then, that in rejecting the Papacy they are not rejecting Catholicity, — the Catholic system itself? Poor men! they must be Catholics, and they will not be Romanists. To be Catholics, they must have the Catholic system, and on Catholic authority, and if they reject Rome, there is no Catholic authority to tell them what it is or is not. They cannot know what it is, unless taught by the Catholic Church, and till they know what it is, they cannot by their method tell what church is Catholic.

Yet, serious as these difficulties are, the Oxford man is not disturbed by them. He is an Oxford man and has extraordinary privileges. He has the privilege of asserting both the affirmative and the negative of the same proposition, and of substituting his own simple assertion wherever evidence or authority fails him. When he wishes to excuse the oscillations from the truth and the manifest errors of his Church, he calls her a human society, and alleges that to err is human; when he would defend her against the state, save her revenues from the attacks of politicians, and silence Dissenters, he asserts her Catholicity, and demands obedience to her as the Church of God; and when he would justify her rejection of the Papacy, and her isolation as the Church of England, he can deny again her Catholicity, and assert the independence of national churches, and the right of the temporal authority to interpose to free the national church from foreign domination and to purge her of her corruptions. And why not? May not a man blow hot breath from his mouth when he would warm his fingers, and cold when he would cool his broth? Do you allege that the several doctrines he is obliged to oppose to the several classes of objectors do not stand well together, and that they are absolutely inconsistent one with another? Be it so. If they are mutually inconsistent and contradictory, that is their affair, not his. He is not, therefore, inconsistent with himself, unless in urging them he acts inconsistently with the nature of an Oxford man, which we are sure very few are so ignorant or so uncandid as to pretend.

That the Church of England has no claim to Catholicity, that she cannot aspire to the honor of being even a schismatical or an heretical church, is evident enough from what we have said, and is clearly evinced from the general tone and spirit of the work before us. The things which the author contends for,

and which, if practised by her, would in his opinion make her Catholic, all exist in our Church in their perfection, and have always existed there, but have been unknown in the Church of England since the Protestant Reformation. His Anglo-Catholicism, as far below genuine Catholicity as it actually is, is an innovation in his Establishment; it is a novelty to its members, and his imaginary Anglo-Catholics feel that it is something entirely foreign to their habitual modes of thinking and acting. They appear like a rustic who has for the first time put on a court dress. He does not know how to wear it, how to dispose of himself in it, is tickled half to death with its finery, and struts about with a mighty high opinion of himself, feeling that he must be a great man since he has such a fine suit of clothes to his back.

We have been greatly amused with the portions of the author's work in which he describes the pious practices of his Anglo-Catholics. Things which no Catholic would think of mentioning, because it would never occur to him that any Christian could be ignorant of them, are dwelt upon at great length, and described with painful minuteness, — not because essential to the action of the piece, but because the author feels that it is necessary to instruct his Church in regard to them. Nothing falls in incidentally, nothing is given by way of simple allusion, or left to be inferred from the turn of a sentence, as in Catholic writers. The hero Villiers appears before a burning house to rescue a boy who is within. He makes his way through the crowd, kneels down, crosses himself, says a short prayer, ascends a ladder, rushes through the flames, seizes the boy, descends with him, nearly suffocated, and drops on his knees, crosses himself again, returns thanks, and vanishes, to the great wonder of Anglicans at the novelty, who are sure that he must be a Papist. If the writer had been a Catholic, he would have said nothing about the crossing, praying, or thanksgiving, for he would have supposed his readers would have taken such things for granted; and if he had been describing a Catholic hero in such a case, very likely he would have said nothing about dropping on the knees, presuming that his hero would be saying his prayer while ascending the ladder, and returning thanks while descending it. The Catholic, too, though he would have prayed, would have been less attentive to the attitude in which he prayed. You would never find him laying such stress upon mere forms. Writers lay great stress upon forms only where they are neglected, or are

generally unknown, or where they have nothing but forms. It is evident to the Catholic reader that the author's Anglo-Catholics have made what is to them a recent discovery. They dwell upon the simplest things with an intense interest which alternates from the tragic to the comic, and from the comic to the tragic. They are all the time praying or talking about prayer, and wondering if they really are or are not excessively happy in their new way of life. All this shows that the things which in the author's view are essential to the Catholic system are novelties in Anglicanism, and are imitated from abroad; whence we may readily conclude that the Anglicanism of the Oxford men is only an imaginary Anglicanism, drawn not from life, displaying not the Anglican Church as she is and must be, but as they wish her to be, and are trying to make her. But, dear Oxford friends, can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?

The hopes of the author for Anglo-Catholicism depended on its state four or five years ago. During the previous ten years he thinks much had been done to raise poor Anglicanism from her dying state. Alas! things have changed since. The hue which he took to be the hue of returning health was only the hectic flush which indicates to the skilful approaching dissolution, which raises the hopes of sympathizing friends for a moment only to dash them with deeper despair. Anglo-Catholicism is now a byword, is seldom referred to, save "to point a moral or adorn a tale." The sincere and earnest part of the Oxford men, the men who gave their movement its character, and almost sanctified it, have abandoned it, and found repose in a Church already made to their hands, and which needs nothing of human tinkering to keep it from falling to ruin, or to restore it to a forgotten Catholicity. They live and labor in no imaginary *Béguinage*. But they who have remained behind are forced to weep over abortive reforms. They mistook the nature of Anglicanism. She is Protestant to the core, and will follow her nature. Their efforts to change her direction have only made her Protestant soul, or rather gizzard, for soul she has none, the more apparent. The day of bright hopes for them has gone by, and a day of gloom and sullen discontent succeeds. We see it in our old friend of the *New York Churchman*. The conversion of Newman, Faber, Oakley, Ward, and others has discouraged him, and he grows pettish and ill-natured. Things have not gone to his mind in England, nor even here at home; and his hopes of bringing Rome to

terms, and of being able, through some concessions on her part, — such as the permission of the clergy to marry, — to unite his communion with hers, without being obliged to confess to heresy and schism, are blasted ; and he stands before the world a disappointed man, craving Catholicity, and yet too proud to embrace it, unless with the appearance of retaining his Anglicanism.

After all, the perusal of *Hawkstone* has made us sad, very sad. We cannot without sadness see men wasting so much thought, and energy, and even right feeling, in vain endeavours to fill their souls with emptiness. Half the labor they expend in fruitless efforts to grasp the shadow would give them the substance. Their complete success in their attempts would give them only the empty forms of Catholicity, without the most distant approach to the reality. Let them succeed in all they undertake, and their Anglicanism would be only the ghastly and grinning skeleton decked out, as at Egyptian feasts, in festive robes, and crowned with wreaths of flowers. The author takes us, in the course of his work, frequently to his Oxford chapel. Alas ! how cold and desolate we found it ! The semblance of an altar was there, but no sacrifice, — the victim was wanting. The appearance of the tabernacle was there, but our Lord in his Humanity as well as in his Divinity was not there to speak to us, and to bless us. His Glory did not fill the temple ; it was no temple, it was but a Jewish synagogue since the Dispersion. We listened to the reading of the Communion Service, and saw bread and wine distributed, and we thought of the poor prodigal who had wasted his substance, sent by his master to feed swine, and craving a share of the husks with which he fed them ; and we thought, too, of our Father's house, where there is bread enough, and to spare, the bread of angels, whereof if a man eat, he shall never die, never hunger, never thirst. O, would they could but see themselves as we see them, and see in the blessed old Church of God what we have found there ! In her exists all they have not and all they need, and in a profusion, in a perfection, which exceeds their power of conception. Why seek they in this empty chapel what they can find only with us, and receive only from the hands of our pastors ? Why stay they here kneeling before this painted wood and polished marble, endeavouring in vain to live by the food that perisheth ? Their fathers have made this chapel desolate ; they feel and bewail it. Why, then, not go to the House that was never desolate, that can never be

desolate ? for behold our God (*Ego sum vobiscum*) has declared that it shall be his habitation unto the consummation of the world. They are ill at ease, anxious, doubting, hoping, despairing, trying to make something out of nothing, and perpetually failing ; why not seek repose in the pavilion of the Almighty, and in the arms of a loving Father ? So we thought within ourselves as we stood in that Oxford chapel ; but the poor worshippers continued to make their genuflections to painted wood and polished marble, and we turned away, saying to ourselves, " Ephraim is joined to his idols ; let him alone."

ART. III. — *Shandy M'Guire, or Tricks upon Travellers : a Story of the North of Ireland.* By PAUL PEPPERGRASS, Esq. New York : Dunigan & Brother. 1848. 12mo. pp. 354.

WE have no respect for the ordinary run of novels, whether written by Catholics, Protestants, or infidels ; but we have never thought of opposing all works of fiction, nor, indeed, all works whose principal aim is to amuse. " All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy." Relaxation is one of the necessities of life, and innocent amusement, moderately indulged, contributes to the health of the mind as well as to that of the body. We object to novels in general, because they are sentimental, and make the interest of their readers centre in a story of the rise, progress, and termination of the affection or passion of love. Sentimental tales, whatever the natural sentiment they are intended to illustrate, are seldom unobjectionable ; for they almost inevitably tend to destroy all vigor and robustness of character, and to render their readers weak and sickly. But even if intrusted with the censorship, we should never think of placing such works as *Shandy M'Guire* on the Index. We are, indeed, far from regarding it as faultless, either in style or matter, but we recognize in its author a robust and healthy mind, true manliness of thought and feeling, and genius of a high order. It is brilliant, full of wit and humor, and genuine tenderness and pathos. It is evidently the production of a scholar, a Catholic, and a patriot, and we trust is but the harbinger of many more works like it, which are to be welcomed from the same source. With his rare genius, uncommon

abilities, rich cultivation, brilliant yet chaste imagination, warmth of heart, mirthfulness, poetic fancy, artistic skill, and dramatic power, the author cannot fail, if he chooses, to attain to the highest excellence in the species of literature he has selected.

Shandy M'Guire is the production of an Irishman, and a genuine Irish story. None but an Irishman, and a Catholic Irishman, could have written it. It is a tale, or rather a gallery of pictures, of the North of Ireland, in which the Irishman is presented to us as he is and as he ought to be. It gives us a lively and correct view of the actual state of things in that part of the island, — of the actually existing relations between the Catholics and Protestants, the landlords and their tenantry, — the tyranny and intrigues practised by the former and their cold-blooded agents, and the oppressions, wrongs, and insults endured by the latter. It enables us to see all for ourselves, and to take nothing on mere hearsay. It sets us down in the county Donegal, and permits us to judge for ourselves. It makes us feel the insults heaped upon the unoffending and powerless people. We grow indignant at slandered innocence, as we see the poor and the virtuous oppressed, driven out to perish of famine in the fields and highways, and we inwardly swear we will strike for Ireland, and never desist till the tyrant is humbled and Irishmen have their rights again. This, no doubt, is the effect which the author has wished to produce on his readers. His work is full of fun and frolic, but it has been written with a serious and a lofty purpose. The author has wished to arouse his countrymen to the assertion of their rights and their national freedom. We honor him for this, and we are pleased to find that he aims to do it chiefly by appeals to their reverence for their religion, and to their sense of their rights and dignity as men. In a few instances he is on the point of forgetting — perhaps does forget — the Christian and the man in the *Irishman*; but, in general, he appeals to his countrymen as men and Christians, and places their cause on the broad ground of justice and humanity, on which men not Irishmen may take it up and defend it as their own. He is a true patriot, but he repels us by no morbid nationality of his own, and demands justice to his countrymen without demanding injustice to others. He does not merely excite pity for Ireland, but he makes us respect the Irish character; and we are sorry to add, that his is almost the only work of a recent Irish patriot that we have seen of which we can say this, — almost the only work it will do

to read, if one would think better of Ireland and the Irish. It is well adapted to place the Irish in a true light, and will go far to redeem their character with our countrymen from the ridicule and contempt thrown upon it by the injudicious attempts of ignorant and conceited editors, lecturers, and historians to exalt it. We thank the author warmly for its influence upon our own feelings. The Irish papers and histories which we had been reading for years had had their influence upon us, and we were fast losing our early partiality for the Irish people. It has restored us to the love and respect for them which we had imbibed with our mother's milk, and which we hope we shall always be able to retain and ready to cherish.

Unhappily for Ireland, it has long been her fate to find her worst enemies in her own children, and to suffer more from those who would defend than from those who would traduce her. She has rarely, if ever, spoken for herself. Her best and soundest men have remained silent. Her character has been left to the mercy of her Protestant enemies, or, what is even worse, to her own conceited and moonstruck patriots. The work before us leads us to hope that a new era in her history is about to dawn ; that the time has come when we may hear the genuine Irish voice, — not the melodious wail of Moore, exciting compassion, but killing respect, — not the voice of bombastic orators and ignorant editors, turning even Irish virtue and nobility into ridicule, — but the voice of enlightened patriotism, of manly feeling, sound sense, and practical judgment. Now that the ill-judged attempt of Smith O'Brien and his Young Irelanders to get up an insurrection, which could only involve the country in all the horrors of civil war without gaining any thing for national freedom, has failed, men who are true Irishmen, who represent the sober sense, the enlightened judgment, the faith and piety, the reasonable hopes and practical tendencies of the Irish nation, may come forward and speak without having their voices drowned in the vociferations of a maddened crowd, wrought up to the verge of insanity by unprincipled demagogues and fiery agitators ; and the moment they do come forward, the moment they are able to command attention and place themselves at the head of affairs, the world will change its judgment of Ireland, the nation will respond to them with heart and soul, and the more serious of her grievances will be speedily redressed. Ireland has such men, — large numbers of them, — but they have hitherto stood back, and the world has judged her only

by the forth-putting youths, or inflated patriots, whom they saw on every occasion taking the lead. What wonder, then, that the world, while it has pitied her misfortunes, and wept over the tale of her sufferings, has refused to respect her national character, or to believe her deserving any thing better than subjection to England ?

The Irish patriots, even those whom under many relations we love and honor, seem to us to have studied to make a favorable impression on their own countrymen rather than on Englishmen or Americans. The speeches of O'Connell, the political letters of several eminent prelates, and the bold and daring editorials of *The Nation*, as well fitted to operate upon the Irish mind, and really able and eloquent, as they unquestionably are, do not always move our Anglo-Saxon mind in the direction intended. They do not win our confidence, convince our reason, or enlist our feelings. We see their effect on the Irish mind and heart, and ask, Why is it that they have so little effect on Englishmen and Anglo-Americans ? Is it that Irish human nature is essentially diverse from Anglo-Saxon human nature ? It cannot be ; for God has made of one blood all the nations of the earth. Is it that Anglo-Saxons have no human feelings, no sense of justice, no generosity, no chivalric sentiments ? We scorn the insinuation. Is it that we have so long listened to the calumniators of Ireland that we cannot hear without prejudice any thing in her favor ? It is false, for the calumnies of her enemies often do more to awaken our sympathies for her than the eulogiums of her friends. There is nothing in Anglo-Americans, and we do not believe even in the great body of the English themselves, of that deep and inveterate prejudice against the Irish which some Irishmen imagine. Burke was an Irishman, an Irish patriot, and yet we cannot read a page of his writings on Irish affairs without surrendering to him at discretion. He instantly enlists all our sympathies in favor of his countrymen, and we feel sure, as we read on, that the wrongs which England has inflicted on Ireland have not yet been told, and that the sufferings of the Irish people are greater than have been represented, greater than language can represent. Here is a proof, that, Anglo-Saxon as we are, we are not prejudiced against the Irish, and that it is not true that we credit only her enemies.

Why is it that we so readily yield to Burke what we refuse to these speeches, letters, and editorials ? Is it not that Burke writes for the Anglo-Saxon mind, while these are written for the

Irish mind ? Burke appeals to the broad sense of justice and humanity common to all men ; these appeal to Irish nationality, which only Irishmen can feel in its full force. To respond to them heartily, we must not only recognize the justice of the complaints of the Irish, but we must, in some sort, abjure our own race, our own nation, our own identity, and make ourselves Irishmen ; he keeps the distinction of races out of sight, and offends us neither by his mistimed praise of the Celtic, nor by his mistimed denunciation of the Saxon. He places before us the tyrant and his victim, and arms us in defence of the victim against the tyrant, without exciting any pride or prejudice of race ; they keep before us always the fact, that the tyrant is a Saxon and the victim a Celt, and even when their authors have no intention, and are actually unconscious, of doing it. They strike us as the outpourings of the hoarded wrath of centuries, sinking us and our race to hell. Even their Catholicity has occasionally a Celtic accent, and we half feel, as we read, that hatred of the Saxon and desire of vengeance upon his guilty head are all but essential to one's Christian character.

Now all this is very well, if the aim is simply to operate on the Celtic population, to fire their patriotism, and to rouse them to efforts for their country's liberation ; but very unwise, if the authors wish to enlist the sympathies and energies of Englishmen and Anglo-Americans in the cause of Ireland. It provokes the wrath or contempt of these, — wrath, if they regard the Irish as strong, — contempt, if they look upon them as weak, and only giving utterance to mortified national vanity or wounded sensibility. It tends to isolate the Irish, and to make them enemies where they might easily gain friends. It tends to convert what should be a war against oppression for common justice into a war of races, in which the Irish must lose more than they can gain. The Celtic may be the nobler, the more deserving race, but it cannot be denied that the Anglo-Saxon is, at present, the more powerful. It would seem, therefore, to be the true policy of Irish patriots to keep, as far as possible, the distinction of races out of the question, and to be careful not to bring the pride of the one race into conflict with the pride of the other. In a struggle for Irish liberty on the simple ground of justice, half of England would remain neutral or side with Ireland ; in a war of races, all England to a man would arm against her. In the former case, Ireland could command the moral influence of the world, and the phys-

ical force of as many chivalric lances as she would need ; in the latter, she would be thrown entirely on her own resources, and left to struggle single-handed. We love and honor the Irish people, and hold their rights as dear as our own, — not, however, because they are Irish, the descendants of Míleg or Milesius, of whom we know nothing, but because they share our common humanity, — are our neighbours and our brethren, whom we are commanded to love as ourselves. They have fallen into the hands of robbers, who have stripped and wounded them, and left them half dead. We would pour the oil and wine into their wounds, and restore them to their health and possessions. But if they should insist, that, before doing this, we must abjure our Anglo-Saxon blood, and make ourselves Celts, we should feel ourselves free to leave them as we found them, with simple pity for their weakness or intolerant nationality. We are willing to leave them their identity, but they must leave us ours, if they expect us to work with them or for them.

We are well aware that many of the Irish patriots really seek to avoid the contest of races, and labor to effect in Ireland a union of all Irishmen, without distinction of race or creed, for the liberty of their common country. But we like this no better than the cry of “ Death to the Saxon,” for the union is practicable only on conditions which would extinguish the old Celtic race and civilization, which we are anxious to preserve. The Anglo-Saxons in Ireland — those, we mean, who retain their distinctive character, and have not become absorbed in the original Celtic population — are the party which oppresses Ireland, and renders an effort for freedom necessary. It is not England out of Ireland, but England in Ireland, that causes the mischief. To call upon England in Ireland to make common cause with the patriots for the freedom of Ireland is only to call upon the tyrant to make common cause with his victim.

The fact, that the union of parties has to be sought, to be labored for, is a proof that the two parties have not the same interest, and that the liberty wanted by the one is not the liberty wanted by the other. If the interests of both parties were the same, their union would come of itself, as a matter of course. As the case stands, it can be effected only by a compromise, and that compromise must be all on one side, — a concession on the part of the patriots of all that they are struggling for. The Celtic Irish, in order to effect it, must be able to make it for the interest of the Anglo-Irish to cut themselves loose from England, which they can do only by consenting to become

more completely their slaves than they now are. The Anglo-Irish have no country but England, and they regard Ireland as their country only in so far as it is inseparably united to England, and under the British government. They cannot, then, be made to join the patriots from love of country. To make them abjure England, and adopt Ireland separated from England, you must give them something more than they can get by union with England. And what have you to give them? They are now the ruling caste, and are sustained in their dominion by their connection with the English government. How will you make them believe it is for their interest to sever that connection, and to make common cause with you against England, which sustains them in power over you, unless you give them sufficient guaranties, in some shape, of a more extended and complete dominion over you than they now have, or can have, if the connection with England continues?

The union of races in Ireland, it is clear, is possible only on the condition that the Celt consents to be swallowed up in the Saxon. The Saxon must be continued as the ruling race, and for Celtic Ireland we should have a Saxon Ireland. The original population of the island, the oldest people now known, retaining, perhaps, the earliest civilization of which any traces have been preserved, would become gradually extinguished through slavery, or lost in the dominant race. No friend to Ireland can wish this. We wish to see *Celtic* Ireland preserved. We would not see the old Irish nationality destroyed, or even weakened. We respect it, and should regret to see the old Celtic civilization give way to the Anglo-Saxon. We may not like to have the Irishman perpetually thrusting his nationality into our faces, telling us, when he is pleased with us, that we have a great deal of the Irishman in us, and cursing us as a Saxon dog when we are so unfortunate as to displease him, but we would not see him less of an Irishman than he is. We are Saxon, and intend to remain so; for we are not yet convinced that we cannot be Catholic without being Celtic; but we know few things more ridiculous than the Irishman who disowns his own order of civilization, and undertakes to pass for a Yankee. A *Yankeeified* Irishman is a sorry sight. He has abandoned the good qualities of his own race, without adopting the good qualities of ours, and is merely a compound of the bad qualities of each. No: let the Irishman remain an Irishman, and the Anglo-Saxon remain an Anglo-Saxon; and while they study to love and respect each other as brothers, let neither attempt or sup-

pose that either ought to be the other. Each has his peculiar excellences, and each his peculiar defects, and it is not necessary to undertake to strike the balance between them. We would have neither swallowed up in the other. In our day-dreams for Ireland, we have pictured her rising from her thralldom, after ages of oppression and misery, to her proper rank among the nations of the earth, a genuine Celtic kingdom, retaining and transmitting the virtues and the glories of the old Celtic race. The union of Saxon and Celt on the soil of Ireland for such an end is impossible, and any end for which it could be effected would be opposed to it, and necessarily tend to defeat it.

For the same reason, we are opposed to the call for a union without distinction of creed. Celtic Ireland is at heart Catholic, and can be nothing else. Its essential character is gone, if it ceases to be Catholic. Protestant Ireland is English, and depends for its existence on the connection with England. Sever that connection, give the power to the national party, and it would soon melt away before Catholic Ireland. Protestant Ireland knows this. On what conditions, then, will it make common cause with Catholic Ireland? On the condition that Catholic Ireland is to rule? Not at all. It will demand a guaranty that Catholic Ireland shall either cease to be Catholic, or be subject to Protestant Ireland. The Protestant coöperation can be purchased on no other condition, unless we suppose the Protestants are prepared to sign their own death-warrant as Protestants; and this guaranty must be given in the shape of democracy, or in that of indifferentism, for it can be given in no other. If the patriots waive their Catholicity, put their Church out of the question, and make politics the paramount affair, the Protestant may consent to unite with them, if he is to run no great pecuniary hazard; for he knows very well, that, when Catholics suffer any interest to take precedence of their religion, or when they become willing to forsake it for a temporal object, however laudable in itself, there is very little to be feared from it. Indifferentism is sure to follow, and then in religious matters the Protestant can have every thing his own way. Democracy, which in a country like Ireland must be Jacobinism, will afford him an equal guaranty, and therefore in a Jacobinical revolution he might not be unwilling to engage; for he cannot but see that a democracy in Ireland would throw the whole power of the state into the Protestant party, who are the principal owners of the soil. The natural tendency of a

democracy is to throw the power of the state into the hands of the property-holders by the voluntary action of the party without property, and to engross a whole people with their material interests. A people ruled by the representatives of money, and engrossed with material interests, make but sorry Catholics, — such Catholics as Protestants would have nothing to fear from. But a democratic, or rather Jacobinical, Ireland under the rule of Protestant proprietors and indifferent demagogues, bent only on material interests, would be any thing but Celtic Ireland, and do any thing but preserve the old Celtic civilization and the primitive virtues of the Milesian race.

The call for a union of parties in Ireland without distinction of race or creed proceeds on what we regard as a false assumption, namely, that the real enemy of Ireland is the England out of Ireland. That enemy is England in Ireland, and an enemy that would be too strong for the Celtic population, even if it had no connection with England out of Ireland. Ireland is lost, if she severs her connection with Great Britain before she has subdued the England on her own soil. What seems to us, then, Ireland's true policy is, to detach the England out of Ireland from the Anglo-Irish, and gain its support for the national party. We would use the connection for the benefit of Celtic Ireland, instead of seeking to get rid of it. England has no real interest in supporting at the expense of the Celto-Irish the Anglo-Saxon party in Ireland, and she does it only because she believes that it is through their means, and theirs only, that she has been able to keep the crown of Ireland united with her own. They were her garrison in the country. She was obliged to support them, or lose the crown of Ireland. Let Celtic Ireland make her peace with England out of Ireland, and she can easily use the power of the imperial government to protect her against the England in Ireland, from whom she suffers her principal grievances. This may require time for its full accomplishment ; but it is not impracticable. Let the case be presented to the British government on its merits, as a question of justice and sound policy, without any vexing questions as to race or to bygone times, without any thing to humble the pride of either party, or to revive old animosities, and we are sure that the government could be induced to take the side of the Irish people, and to redress their grievances, as far as it is in the power of government to redress them.

The gifted author of the work before us, while his book shows clearly that the real enemy of Ireland is on her own soil,

seems to think that the true policy for the patriots is the reverse of this. He appears to think that the landlords — the real oppressors of Ireland — would soon be brought to terms, if they no longer had England to back them. But he seems to us to forget that it is an axiom in political science, that they who hold the balance of the property of a nation are its masters. Man against money struggles in vain. We have never read or heard of a successful agrarian party, and in a war of the poor against the rich we have invariably found the poor defeated. Nineteen twentieths of the soil of Ireland, we are told, are held by the Anglo-Irish party, and the commercial and manufacturing capital of the national party is far from sufficient to overbalance this proportion of the landed property. Their combined wealth must fall far short of that of their enemies. Let the national party do their best, then, whatever their numbers, their personal skill or bravery, and they can gain, at most, only a transient success, as the experience of ages has proved. The victory, if gained, will slip from their grasp as soon as won.

We know it is said that these landlords may be dispossessed, their estates confiscated, and distributed among the members of the national party. That is very true, if you have already a strong national government firmly established which is disposed to do it ; but not otherwise. A mob can plunder and lay waste, but it cannot confiscate, for it has no fisc. The national party, supposing it to have succeeded, supposing it to have got the landlords in its power, could, undoubtedly, confiscate their estates ; but the difficulty is, that it cannot succeed until it has confiscated them. If it had on its own side men who would or could advance, on a pledge of the lands, the necessary funds for carrying on the war, this difficulty might be got over ; but it has not, and the scrip of the patriots issued on lands not in their possession, we apprehend, would be at a heavy discount in foreign markets. The contributions of Irish patriots out of Ireland would, no doubt, be something, but altogether inadequate to the struggle which the landlords would find means enough to protract.

We may be wrong, but we have no belief that the patriots, obliged to struggle single-handed against the landholders, let alone England, would be able to sustain themselves. In such struggles numbers alone are not enough, and even personal bravery is not much, as the whole history of the world proves. The first want of Ireland is some power to control the land-

lords and to compel them to do justice to their tenants ; and we cannot see where she is to get this power, but from the imperial government. The landlords themselves dread the appeal of the patriots to that government, and feel that their security is much more endangered by Irish loyalty than by Irish rebellion, as has been proved on more occasions than one ; and the very moment the imperial government shall undertake to restrain their excesses, and to compel them to treat their tenants with ordinary humanity, they will themselves turn patriots, and shout " Repeal ! " as loud as the loudest. Is not this evident from the fact, that they are constantly fomenting and exaggerating what they are pleased to term Irish disloyalty ? Is it not plain that what they most dread is that the patriots should supplant them at the English court ? And is not this precisely what they study to prevent ? How, then, can the Irish patriot mistake his true policy ?

The author seems to us, also, to proceed on the assumption, that the Irish owe no allegiance to the British crown. But in taking this ground, is he not playing into the hands of Ireland's worst enemies ? By what means do the landlords contrive to practise their oppression with impunity ? By what means do they contrive to secure the protection of the British government, while they starve their tenantry, or compel them to seek relief in exile, or from the hands of strangers ? Is it not by filling the ears of that government with tales of Irish disloyalty ? Is it not by making the government believe that the Irish regard the sway of the English as a usurpation, and themselves as free, at any moment the opportunity offers, to throw it off, and therefore that it must not treat them as loyal subjects, and must place no reliance on their professions of loyalty ? Was it not O'Connell's greatest difficulty to convince the government of his loyalty, and of that of the Repeal movement ? Has not England supported the landlords and their party almost solely on the pretence, if it be a pretence, that it is only through them that it can retain the crown of Ireland, and that to abandon them and to support the Celto-Irish would be only to give up the possession of Ireland altogether ? Is it wise, then, to proclaim a doctrine which, if really held by the Irish, would fully confirm what their enemies allege, and appear to go far towards justifying the Irish policy of the English government ?

Aside from the abominable measures adopted for the suppression of the Catholic religion, and which were adopted to a great extent in England herself as well as in Ireland, and which

the Act of Emancipation has now abolished in both countries, the English policy in the government of Ireland has evidently been founded on the assumption, that the Irish deny their allegiance to the crown, and hold themselves free, whenever the occasion offers, to throw it off. Supposing this to be true, supposing that England is to govern Ireland at all, it will be hard to prove that her policy has not been in the main just and necessary. If Ireland denies her allegiance, she may complain that England has attempted to govern her, but she cannot complain that England has governed her as a disloyal province, ready at any moment to break out into open revolt. No disloyal people has the right to complain of not being well governed ; you must acknowledge your allegiance to the crown before you have a right to its protection. If we are not mistaken, the Irish patriots have made the world resound with their complaints of England's misgovernment of Ireland ; will they explain to us on what grounds they have made these complaints, if they have never owed allegiance to the crown ? The only thing, if they take this ground, of which they can have any right to complain is, that England originally invaded Ireland, and has attempted to keep possession of her. After all, is it not in this view of the author that lies the secret of much of the misery which Ireland has been compelled to suffer for so many ages ? The Abbé MacGeoghegan, an Irish patriot, in his *History of Ireland Ancient and Modern* (pp. 255, 256), says, — “ The sway of the English in Ireland was considered by the natives as a violence, an injustice, and usurpation ; consequently, any engagement made with them was looked upon not to be binding. They did not think themselves bound by the law of nature, which forbids us either to take the goods of others or to do violence to their will. They therefore thought themselves dispensed with, from keeping their word with a people who observed no treaty with them, and whose only rule was the law of the strongest ; like a man who, having given his purse to save his life, thinks he has a right to reclaim it when the danger is over. These are the principles the Irish observed in their conduct towards the English.” Whether these principles are sound or unsound is not the question we raise ; but is not the fact, that the Irish originally acted on them, the secret of that distrust of the native Irish which the English government has so generally manifested ? Has not England chosen to assume that the Irish continue to act on these principles ? And if they do act on them, how can she trust them ?

What other course is left for her, than to plant her garrisons throughout the kingdom, to hold the natives down by the strong arm of power, and to lavish her favors upon her colonies settled among them? It was the only condition on which she could keep possession of the island. Did the Irish suffer? Were they oppressed? What then? It was their own fault; it was owing to their determination to revolt, to resist her authority, whenever they could. Certainly, England has taken this view of the case, and this is the only reason that can be assigned why her Irish subjects have not been as well governed as her English subjects.

That the Irish have not been sufficiently careful to undeceive England on this point, and to place their loyalty beyond a question, and that many of those who have assumed to speak for them have from time to time used language which favors the view the British government has taken, may be true; but that the great body of the Irish people have continued in a state of actual or virtual rebellion against British authority, from the time of Henry the Second down to our own day, we are loath to believe. We regard it as a mistake, in which the government has persevered through the influence of the anti-national party in Ireland. But be this as it may, we cannot doubt that the patriots should lose no time in removing the fact or the pretext on which the British government justifies or attempts to justify its Irish policy. The English government claims the crown of Ireland as inseparably united to her own, and she has exercised the lordship of Ireland for these seven hundred years. Whether its claim be valid or invalid, she will not voluntarily surrender it. She will hold on to it as long as she is able. Threats will not induce her to relax her grasp. If you make her feel that her possession is insecure, you make it her duty, in her view of her rights, to take that course which in her judgment will most effectually guard it against your attempts to wrest it from her; and if you suffer in consequence, she will feel that the responsibility is yours, not hers.

Moreover, the declaration, No allegiance to the British crown, and that it is not treason to seek to overthrow its authority, places Ireland in a very unpleasant condition. It dissolves the Irish state, dissolves every civil and political institution which the patriots will acknowledge to be such, annihilates the entire body politic and corporate, and leaves the Irish without either civil rights or civil duties. Ireland has no national government aside from the English government; and separate from Eng-

land, politically considered, there is no Irish people. The old Irish state subsisting at the Conquest has been destroyed ; the old native kings and chieftains have no longer any political existence in regard either to foreigners or to the natives. Severed from England, the inhabitants of Ireland are thrown back into a state of nature, and have not a single political or civil faculty. The case is not with her as it was with us when we declared our independence, as some of her patriots at home and in this country seem to imagine. We had local colonial governments, with their roots in the nation, and prevented only by the overshadowing of the British crown from being supreme governments. The removal of the crown did not dissolve them ; it left them standing in the plenitude of national sovereignty, and the allegiance we had given to the crown was naturally transferred to them, — if, indeed, it was not already due them, and due to the crown only through them. But in Ireland there is nothing of this. Her government is not a national government *under* the crown of Great Britain, but it derives from the British government, and is the British government itself, extended to Ireland as an integral part of the empire. To throw off the allegiance to the crown is not to transfer it to the local government, for the local government goes with the crown. It is not to transfer it to the present Irish nobility, because they are Irish nobles only by virtue of the connection with England. Consequently, the declaration would, as we say, annihilate political Ireland, and leave her without any political existence whatever, and without any nucleus or germ of reorganization. Would the patriots reduce their beautiful country to this deplorable condition ?

No people can live in such a deplorable condition, for no people can live where there is no government, no public authority, no law, no justice ; and no people reduced to such a condition can ever of themselves recover from it. The patriots may imagine, that, if severed from England, they could reconstitute the state, reëstablish government, and provide for its wise and just administration ; but this is the dream of inexperience or enthusiasm. You may talk this to the disciples of a school that holds Providence to be superfluous, and regards man as his own sire ; but it is too late to talk it to Christians and statesmen. Constitutions are generated, not made ; they may be imposed upon a people by a competent authority, but can never be created by the people themselves. No people ever did, or ever can, give themselves a constitution ; for no

people can act as a people, till constituted. Moreover, there is no government where there is no loyalty, and loyalty to one's own creations is impossible and absurd. The Irish, even if so much, could only enter into a voluntary association, and form a sort of voluntary engagement with each other ; but such association is not a state, — has not a single element of a state, — and such engagement is no political constitution, and has and can have of itself no legal force or sanction. It can have no right to impose its acts as laws, or to exact and enforce obedience to them. Nothing is government that is not *over* the governed, *sovereign* (*super*, *supernus*, *superus*) ; and that is not *over* them which they themselves make and may unmake at will. Authority speaks always from above, not from below.

It is true that the Catholic Church in Ireland might remain, if the connection with England were severed, and, as the only surviving element of the old Celtic constitution, she would, no doubt, legally inherit the full sovereignty of the Irish state, and that, too, without claiming temporal dominion for the Church, *jure divino*. The people might then, indeed, rally under the authority of the Irish hierarchy, and reëstablish through them a legal political order. But we cannot in these times expect them to do so. It would by no means suit the politicians, and we may be sure that they would never consent to it, unless on the condition that they themselves should govern the hierarchy ; which would involve the destruction of the Church in Ireland by making it their tool, and thus destroy again the very condition of temporal government.

Under whatever point of view we consider the subject, then, the denial of allegiance to the British crown, or rather to the Irish crown inseparably united with the British, seems to us, to say the least, bad policy. The patriots are ill prepared to take that ground ; and the consequences of taking it, in the present state of things, would prove ruinous to the national cause. It would place them and their followers out of the protection of the law, would, at best, establish belligerent relations between them and England, and give to England the right, as far as in her power, to rule Ireland by military law. Before attempting to resume the independence of the Irish crown, they should prepare an Irish head to wear it ; or, in other words, obtain for their country a national organization which can legally assume the exercise of national sovereignty the moment independence of England is declared.

We cannot, it is plain from this, sympathize with the movement of the Young Ireland party for the complete national independence of their country. Their movement, if not, as England holds it, treasonable, is at least premature and impolitic. They would find it a difficult matter to succeed even against the Anglo-Irish alone, and could have no reasonable prospect of success against them backed by the whole force of the empire. They could, in all human probability, count only on experiencing the defeats so often and so fatally experienced by their ancestors. Their attempt is undeniably rash, and therefore unlawful. They have no moral right to make it, and cannot with a safe conscience persuade others to join them in it. We know it is easy to sneer at the timid counsels of prudence, yet prudence is one of the cardinal virtues. He who engages in a rash enterprise is responsible for the consequences. He who induces men to rebel, even for a legitimate cause, when there is no reasonable prospect of success, is guilty of a mortal sin; and if they are shot down in the battle he provokes, he is guilty of their blood. We say not this because we are a "moral force" man. We do not belong to the party of the Broadbrims, and have no wish to engraft Quakerism upon Catholicity. We believe in the lawfulness of resistance to tyranny, and, if need be, by physical as well as by moral force. Assure us that the cause is just, that physical force is necessary, that there is a reasonable chance of success, place us under the authority of one who has a legitimate right to lead us, and we have no scruple in resorting to arms, and committing the issue to the God of battles. But to resort to arms, or to induce others to do so, against an existing authority, without any probability of success, is a presuming on Providence, which by no casuistry we are acquainted with can be justified.

But even pass over this, and suppose success, the triumph in arms of the patriots, the chief difficulty remains. The patriots will not acknowledge, we may be sure, any temporal dominion in the Church; for at home and abroad they proclaim the independence of the political order, thank God that the time when the Church guided politicians has passed away, and they will hardly allow her to pronounce on the *morality* of their acts. Suppose the Irish crown severed from the British, where is the Irish head to wear it? No doubt, there are Irish heads enough worthy of a crown, both by descent and by personal qualifications; but, unhappily, there are too many of

them, and no possible means of adjusting their rival claims. They will never be able to agree among themselves which shall wear it. The Anglo-Irish state dissolved, what is to take its place ? If you suppose the old chieftains and kings, you must suppose also the old intestine divisions and internal wars. If they are not supposed, the power must fall into the hands of the military chiefs who have led on the army to victory. These, having no legal sanction for their authority, can exercise it only despotically, and establish nothing but a military despotism. They will soon quarrel with one another, and renew and perpetuate in Ireland the state of things we have seen for the last thirty years in the once prosperous Spanish colony of Mexico, and which is worse, if possible, than even the present misrule and oppression under the Anglo-Irish faction.

But many of the reasons which bear against the movement for *national* independence bear equally against the policy of simple *legislative* independence. Mr. O'Connell acknowledged his allegiance to the United Crown, and sought only by repeal of the Act of Union to restore the Irish Parliament. His policy, as a future policy for Ireland, we certainly hold to be wise and just ; but it seems to us, like the Young Ireland movement which grew out of it, premature, and, in the present posture of affairs, not desirable. In attempting the melioration of Ireland, we should certainly look to Repeal, to legislative independence, to an Irish Parliament, as essential, but not as the *first* measure in the order of time. If Ireland were one and indivisible, if her population were homogeneous, marked only by the ordinary diversities of rank and condition, and if the real enemy to be overcome were not on her own soil, and likely to remain there notwithstanding Repeal, we certainly should regard it as essential, not only as a future, but also as a present measure. But this, unhappily, is not the fact. Unless we have been deceived in all the information we have been able to collect, there are two Irelands, one within the other, diverse in race, in character, in religion, and interest. The one is Celtic Ireland, the other is English Ireland. The former is oppressed, the latter is the oppressor. The most pressing evil of Ireland, as we understand it, is Anglo-Irish or Protestant LANDLORDISM, and the primary want is power to abolish, modify, or restrain it. The simple question then is, Would Repeal and the restoration of the Irish Parliament give to Celtic Ireland this power ? If not, nothing of any real value would be gained ; and Repeal would not give this power, unless it transferred

the government to the hands of the national party. Would it do this ?

We lay it down as an axiom in politics, that, in a representative government at least, power follows the balance of property, — is inevitably in the hands of the party which represents the majority of the wealth of the nation. That party wields the administration, and dictates its measures. The Anglo-Irish are at present, for Ireland, that party, and Repeal can be obtained only on condition that it respects their titles and confirms them in their possessions. What power over them, then, will the national party acquire by Repeal ? If you suppose Repeal, you must suppose an Irish government composed of the king, lords, and commons, each with a veto on the other. The king will be represented by a viceroy appointed by the British government, and removable by the crown. He will always represent English interest and influence. The lords will be composed, almost exclusively, of the obnoxious Protestant landholders, the present oppressors of Celtic Ireland. The commons will be composed of deputies chosen by the boroughs and counties, and will be divided, — a majority, perhaps, ordinarily of the Celtic or national party. Such will be the constitution and composition of the Irish government, and we demand, What measure, tending to restrain the excesses of the landlords and to redress the grievances of their tenantry, could be forced through it ? The viceregal court and the lords, both Anglo-Irish, Protestant, and of the same party, with the same interests, would naturally unite and act in concert ; and what could the commons, divided as they would be among themselves, — for the landlords would always be able to return a large minority, if not occasionally a majority, of the members, — be able to effect against them ?

Are we referred to the conquests made by the commons of England ? Be it so. But we challenge the friends of Repeal to point us to a single conquest effected by the commons of England of the kind needed for the redress of such grievances as now exist in Ireland. The law touching these grievances is no better in England than it is in Ireland. The English landlord has as much legal power to oppress his tenantry as has the Irish landlord ; and if the Irish tenantry are more oppressed than the English, it is owing to other than legal causes. The commons of England may have conquered certain *political* rights from the king, but they have never been able to retrench the privileges of the landlords, or to impose on them

additional burdens. Nay, the landlords have, during the struggle, been able to lighten their own burdens, to relieve themselves of knight-service, and to shift that burden — no light one — upon the non-landholders. In spite of all that the commons of England have been able to do, poverty, distress, and squalid wretchedness are rapidly becoming as great in England as in Ireland herself. It would be difficult to find a population more degraded, more utterly abandoned, than some portions of the English population. The conquests achieved by the perseverance of the English commons do not reach the seat of the evil, in either country, and therefore the appeal to them makes nothing in favor of the Irish Repealer, even setting aside the fact, that the Irish have already secured to them the fruits of those conquests. But even if it were otherwise, nothing could be concluded to the purpose ; for the English commons were a wealthy middle class, which has not its counterpart in Ireland. They represented a mass of wealth which the Irish commons do not and are not likely to represent. They are powerful at this moment, it is conceded ; for the aggregate wealth which, through the commercial and manufacturing classes, they are able to control, joined to their own landed possessions, surpasses that represented by the nobility. But in Ireland it is far otherwise. The commercial and manufacturing wealth of the country, the main reliance of the Irish commons, bears no proportion to the landed wealth which would be against them. They are comparatively poor, and whatever their patriotism, they must find themselves unable to hold out against the other two estates. Moreover, in proportion as they should increase in wealth, they would have less and less sympathy with their poorer countrymen, and be more and more attached to things as they are, and more and more unwilling to engage in a protracted contest against the nobles, with whose families they would have the ambition and the hope to ally themselves.

But an Irish Parliament, we are told, would stimulate industry, encourage commerce and manufactures, and develop the resources of the country. It would be Irish, and promote Irish interests. But would it be Irish ? That is precisely what we doubt. The probability, to say the least, is that it would be Anglo-Irish. But whence follows it that it would, even if Irish, stimulate industry and encourage commerce and manufactures ? Why is it that these languish in Ireland now ? Is it not owing to the want of Irish capital, and to the fact that

as much capital is already invested in commerce and manufactures in other parts of the empire as can be profitably so invested ? Will an Irish Parliament supply the want of Irish capital ? Will it withdraw the capital now invested elsewhere, and reinvest it in Ireland ? What inducements will English capitalists have for investing their capital in Ireland after Repeal is carried that they have not now ? The law now is as favorable to the investment of capital in Ireland as in England, and if capital does not now flow thither, we cannot see what is to make it flow thither then. Will the Irish government make laws more favorable to the capitalists than the present laws of England ? What, then, is to become of the poor laborer ? You can, by your laws, increase the profits of capital only by diminishing the profits of labor, and the profits of labor are low enough now, in all conscience.

Then, again, commerce and manufactures have their bounds, and cannot be pushed beyond certain limits without a ruinous revulsion. The great evil of our modern society lies precisely in the fact that commerce and manufactures are pushed too far. They are overdone. They call around them a larger population than they can feed. To secure to capital its returns, or to save the merchant and manufacturer from ruin, the laborers dependent on them must be thrown out of employment about a third or fourth part of their time, and left to steal, beg, or starve, and not unfrequently to all three. Hence the terrible misery of the laboring classes all through Europe in modern times ; and hence your Red Republicans and your socialistic insurrections and revolutions which within the last year have astonished and shaken the world. Any further extension of the modern industrial system, save as it comes in the natural course of things, is madness. Commerce lives only by agriculture and manufactures. The agriculture of Ireland will demand no extended commerce, and the manufacturing power now in operation, or ready to be put in operation at a moment's warning, elsewhere, is more than sufficient to glut and to keep glutted the markets of the world. The application of steam to navigation and production, the invention and adoption of labor-saving machinery, during the last half-century, have caused the power of production to exceed, in the existing economical systems of society, the power of consumption ; and you cannot, unless you can double the latter, extend the former, without a loss which must fall somewhere, and which, wherever it falls in the first instance, must inevitably, in the last, fall

on the laborer. In other words, the interests of agriculture and labor cannot, in the present state of the world, sustain a more extended system of commerce and manufactures than is now in operation. These have reached the highest proportion they will bear, and, if we do not misunderstand the late European revolutions, a far higher proportion than they will bear. Their continuance on their present scale must necessarily result, not in stimulating labor and developing the agricultural resources of nations, but in depressing agriculture and in reducing wages below the minimum of human subsistence, and therefore, ultimately, in their own ruin and that of the people. Their further growth, if healthy, in one country must be their decline in another; and this further growth is more likely to be in this country than in any European country. The seat of empire is evidently passing from the Old World to the New, and the grand highway of trade is hereafter to be across this continent and the Pacific to the old Asiatic world, which may ere long in no small degree supplant the European.

A hasty glance at the British European empire is sufficient to show that its commercial and manufacturing power has reached, perhaps passed, its culminating point. It is now sustained only by encroaching on the interests of agriculture and the wages of labor. Up to a certain point, commerce and manufactures enhance the wages of labor and the profits of agriculture; but pushed beyond that point, they have the opposite effect. That they have been pushed beyond that point in Great Britain seems to us evident from the depression experienced by the agricultural interests, the ruinous poor-rates assessed upon small farmers, and the inability of the laborers to find constant employment or sufficient wages for their comfortable subsistence. They now tax land and labor. Ireland, after Repeal as well as now, will be attached to the empire, and must, in some degree, share its prosperity and its adversity. It is certain that she cannot extend the aggregate capital now invested in the commerce and manufactures of the United Kingdom, without an injury to the empire which she herself will not be able altogether to escape. All she can hope to do is, to gain at the expense of England, — to transfer to herself a portion of the commerce and manufactures now confined to the sister island. That is, she can hope to make herself a huge manufacturing establishment and a vast *entrepôt* of commerce only by competing successfully with England, who already has the start of her, as many natural advantages as she has, and infinitely more

acquired advantages. She must transfer the manufacturing capital and establishments from England to herself, and coax the English ships from English harbours to her own. Now when somebody will tell us by what means this can be done, we will concede that a Parliament in College Green, Dublin, will do more for encouraging the commercial and manufacturing industry of Ireland, and the development of her natural resources, than the United Parliament in St. Stephen's, Westminster, but not till then.

But a national Parliament will put an end to absenteeism, compel the landlords to reside on their own estates, to look after the welfare of their tenantry, and to spend their revenues at home instead of a foreign country. That it will put an end to absenteeism is not so certain. Absenteeism is an old complaint, and we find that it existed before the Legislative Union, nay, before the Protestant Reformation, and that king after king exerted his power to compel the Irish landlords to reside at home on their estates, and look after their people, but always with indifferent success. What has been may be ; and if a national legislature did not formerly prevent absenteeism, we see not the certainty that it will hereafter prevent it. The royal court at London will always present attractions for the rich, the accomplished, the ambitious, the fashionable, the dissipated, the frivolous, the vain, superior to those of the viceroy's court at Dublin ; and as long as it does, absenteeism will continue. As long, also, as living on the Continent continues to be less expensive, and society more attractive, than in England or Ireland, men whose estates are embarrassed, and who are unable to keep up at home establishments suitable to their social rank, will seek longer or shorter residences abroad. This may or may not be an evil, but it is what an insular people must always be more or less exposed to.

Then it is far from certain that the home residence of the absentee landlords would cure all the evils, or any considerable portion of the evils, of which the Irish people complain. One of the great evils to which they are exposed, if we may believe Paul Peppergrass, Esq., is the constant annoyance experienced from the efforts of Protestant landlords to pervert them to Protestantism. Colonel Templeton is to some extent a resident landlord, and when he is, he is constantly annoying his tenantry by his proselyting zeal, and his agent takes advantage of this zeal to cover his worst villanies. These landlords are nearly all Protestants, and their residence at home would only

increase this evil. They would want some employment, and they would be driven to the work of proselyting by the necessity of filling up their vacant hours. As to spending their money at home, we cannot see, if there is any truth in the doctrine of free trade, of which, we believe, Mr. O'Connell was an advocate, that it makes any difference to the tenant where his landlord spends his income, unless, indeed, by spending it we understand giving it away. The greatest advantage we can see that would be gained by the home residence is, that it might diminish the importance and the iniquity of the middlemen ; but Colonel Templeton's agent, Archibald Cantwell, is hardly to be preferred to a middleman ; and it is certain, if Paul Peppergrass, Esq., has given us a true picture of society in Ireland, that the end of absenteeism would not be the end of the evils experienced ; for all the evils he depicts take place, if we remember aright, under resident landlords.

When through the imperial government the Irish landlords are shorn of their power to oppress, the Irish have improved their material condition, and there are no longer any special causes of hostility between the two Irelands, legislative independence will become a wise and useful measure, and may be easily obtained. It may then be a step towards national independence, because then the Irish Parliament may become the depositary of the sovereignty after the rejection of the English crown, and enable the Irish to separate from England without dissolving the state and annihilating the body politic. But till then, so far as we can judge at this distance and from all the information we have been able to collect, the true policy of the Irish patriot is, to hold on to the connection with England, and to labor to turn it to the advantage of his countrymen.

The first step, it seems to us, should be, to supplant the Anglo-Irish party at the English court and in the imperial Parliament, and thus secure the protection of the government for the national party, — induce England to govern Ireland through the Celtic Irish instead of the Anglo-Irish. Surely this can be done. The patriots assuredly will not contend that they are inferior in any respect to their opponents, that the Celt must, in any sphere, pale before the Saxon. Assuredly, it must be far easier for them to supplant the landlords by their talents, learning, eloquence, and statesmanship, than to conquer them, and England into the bargain, by force of arms.

Ireland has one hundred and five members of Parliament. Let her first care be to elect, not only patriotic members, but

members who will do her credit, who will be more than a match for a like number of the English members in learning and talent, in their genius for business, and their clear and comprehensive views. Let them be men of character, men whose support a ministry would seek, and whose opposition it would dread. She of course has such men, and can elect them ; or else how would she prosper, were she to set up on her own account? Let her throw a body of one hundred and five members, or even one half of that number, into Parliament, who are not men of theories, not men thrown off their balance by their memories, or their recollections of Tara's Halls or Brian Boru, but men who, while they love their country, while they are true to Irish interests, love also the empire, know its interests, and are ready to promote them, and she will have a weight in Parliament, and therefore with the crown, that will secure her a hearing and a redress of her grievances. Let her not feel that she is robbed of her crown. Her crown remains and is hers, as much as ever it was, only it is united with the British crown ; Victoria is her queen as well as England's queen, and the union need imply no more subjection in the one country than in the other. Let her assert her independence, not of the crown, but as a free member of the United Kingdom, and compel England to divide with her, as she has already been compelled to divide with Scotland, the power and glory of the empire. Let her, by a representation fully chosen, enter with a free and a bold heart the Parliamentary lists, and in her collected wisdom, practical sense, firm speech, and dignified bearing, contend for the rights and well-being of her children as British subjects, and on the broader ground of justice and humanity, and no son of hers can fear that she will come off second best.

But whatever the policy the patriotic Irish may agree upon, we hope they will hesitate long before they revive the late system of agitation. If we have not misinterpreted the views of the able author of the work before us, he has no great confidence in that system, and does not regard it as likely to effect much for Ireland. For ourselves, we would not say that it has utterly failed, or that it has effected nothing ; for Catholic Ireland certainly holds to-day a much more important place in the estimation of the British ministry than she did before Mr. O'Connell commenced his agitation for Repeal, and the government would now hardly venture to treat the Catholic Irish with the cool contempt or indifference of former times.

Nevertheless, this may be due in the main to Catholic emancipation, and might, perhaps, have been effected by other modes of operation less expensive than agitation. We are not ignorant of the immense popularity of what is called "peaceful agitation," even out of Ireland, and with others than Irishmen. A few months since, it was a word of great potency. It was pronounced with enthusiasm in every quarter of the globe, and fetched its echoes from Paris, and even from the Eternal City. The disaffected of all lands, reformers of all classes and grades, resorted to it as the grand lever by which to move the world ; and it seemed to be universally agreed that Mr. O'Connell, who was improperly regarded as its originator, for he only adopted it from the sectarian associations of the day, who in their turn only adopted it from the French Jacobins, had discovered and applied the secret of deposing kings, displacing dynasties, subverting governments, breaking up the constitutions of states, resolving nations into primeval chaos, reconstructing society, and regaining the terrestrial paradise, legally, constitutionally, peacefully, without violence, and without disorder. The split in Conciliation Hall, the recent violent revolutions in Europe, the unfurling of the Red Flag by the Parisian agitators, the madness of the mob of Germany and Austria, and the nefarious efforts of the Mamiani ministry to strip the Holy Father of his temporal dominions and to hold him a prisoner in his own capital, to say nothing of the abortive insurrection in Ireland, all legitimate fruits of what in its origin was *peaceful* agitation, have opened some people's eyes to the system itself, and made some persons suspect that its wisdom, its safety, and its efficacy have been not a little overrated. For ourselves, we have always distrusted the system, and we have opposed it in our writings for the last twenty years with what little power we had.

The system is essentially despotic ; it places reason at the service of passion, and seeks to crush the individual freedom of thought by the overwhelming force of combination and numbers. It begins by organizing, under the lead of self-appointed and irresponsible chiefs, an association for the accomplishment of a given object. Whatever of free thought, of deliberation, of calm reason is permitted must precede the organization of the association ; none can be allowed afterwards. When the association is formed, the work is to agitate, not to reason, — to overawe, not to discuss, — to crush opposition, not to convince. The only study then is to inflame the passions or the enthusiasm of the association, and to compel those who stand aloof from it,

as they value their reputations, their possibility of being on passable terms with their neighbours, to fall in and go on with it. If they do not fall in and go on with it, they are traitors to their country, to God, to humanity, to reason, to virtue ; and he who ventures to doubt the infallibility of the association, and to think and act for himself, whether the association be for Repeal as in Ireland, or whether it be for the abolition of slavery as in England and this country, the circulation of the Scriptures, the establishment of Fourierism, the spread of Protestantism, or the conversion of the Pope, — for they are all based on the same general principle, and differ only as to their respective ends, — must be denounced, and the whole force of the association must be brought to bear against him, to blast his reputation, to cripple his exertions, to crush him to the earth, and pulverize him beneath the trampling of its feet. O'Connell was a kind, liberal, generous-hearted man, a sincere Catholic, and remarkable for his tender piety ; but how often did he denounce and blast those of his fellow-laborers who attempted independent thought and action ! Yet it was not he that did it ; it was his system that compelled him to do it. Of what use his association, if divided within, if it did not speak one voice, and present a uniform front to the enemy ?

It is not to the agitation which arises from free and earnest discussion that we object ; nor the free and full discussion of all the great questions which are in their nature open to discussion. What we object to is agitation systematized and carried on through self-constituted and therefore irresponsible associations. These associations are the grand feature of our times, and they are of most dangerous tendency. In the hands of a great and good man, as was O'Connell, directed by his wisdom, loyalty, faith, and piety, they may, perhaps, be comparatively harmless ; but formed for social or political reforms, and placed in the hands of such men as Ledru Rollin, Blanqui, Raspail, Cabet, or Proudhon, or such men as are at the head of the Protestant Alliance or the various Antislavery societies, it is easy to see that they are powerful engines for mischief. They tend necessarily to swamp the individual in the crowd, and to establish a central despotism, which no freeman can endure. If, like the Church, they were Divinely constituted, and placed under the control of Divinely commissioned chiefs, who have from Almighty God the promise of infallibility, they of course would be compatible with the most perfect freedom, and their force would be really a moral force ; but as they are, — purely

human associations, self-formed, sanctioned by no regular authority, and under the control of self-appointed leaders, — they are pure despotisms, are a contrivance to do by force of combination and numbers what no one has any right to do, further than he can do it by individual thought and action. They are, to our way of thinking, far more fatal in the long run to a people than war itself. War slays the body and mangles the limbs, it is true ; the *moral* force of these associations kills reason, slays the soul itself. A people worthy of freedom will scorn them. Even in O'Connell's hands the system became intolerable ; its own children revolted against it, and he, heart-broken, went to die in a foreign land.

In a religious point of view, the system has a most deleterious effect. It destroys the freedom of the clergy, and enslaves religion. Its tendency is to concentrate the mind and the heart on a given object, and to keep out of sight every thing else. It agitates for that one object, makes it all in all, engrosses the mind and heart with it alone. That one object becomes the only thing seen, the only thing desired, the sole remedy of the numerous ills flesh is heir to. It absorbs all moral and all religious considerations in itself, and for the time being religion and morality are esteemed only as they are subsidiary to it. It itself is religion. Agitation for it, then, must spare no one who opposes it, — the clergy no more than the laity. It is supreme, and while it condescends to accept the services of the clergy, and to honor them as long as they serve it, it claims the right to sit in judgment on them and to denounce them, if they venture to arraign it. It has taken possession of the people, and become their guide and master. The clergy are no longer free ; they cannot resist it, without losing all influence with them, and all opportunity to exercise for them the functions of their sacred ministry ; and therefore, if they possibly can, they must, as the less of two evils, fall in with it, and do what they can to direct it, and to prevent it from effecting the complete spiritual ruin of its subjects. But if they fall in with it as the less of two evils, the agitators immediately claim that it has the support of the clergy ; then it is religious ; then its cause is the cause of God as well as of man ; and then no one with a safe conscience can oppose it.

Moreover, the notion, that this system of agitation can be carried on for any great length of time with undiminished enthusiasm and remain *peaceful*, is a fatal mistake. It certainly, when carried on for temporal objects, has never yet been long

continued without resulting in physical violence. It has led to violence in Rome and Italy, in France and Germany, and even in Ireland. The Young Irelanders were legitimately begotten of the Repeal agitation, and it is a mistake to regard them as seceders. They were its natural and inevitable development. Men had for seventeen years been promised Repeal ; had had their attention directed to it, had been agitated and had agitated for it ; had been told, and had believed, that Repeal was the sovereign remedy for the intolerable evils under which they were suffering, — evils rendered doubly intolerable by the continual direction of their minds to them ; and yet Repeal did not come, did not appear to be coming, — appeared, in fact, as far off as ever. They could wait no longer. It was of no use to preach patience to them. Had you not been doing all in your power for seventeen years to render them impatient ? Had you not painted their sufferings to them in the most vivid colors ? Had you not exhausted imagination and language in describing the horrors of their condition ? Had you not expended all your force in arousing them to the most lively sense of their wrongs ? Had you not inflamed them, and worked them up to the highest pitch of impatience ? And after this, could you suppose they would be calm and quiet, that they would be *patient*, at your bidding ? It is not thus that we have learned human nature. They saw that you had exhausted your *peaceful* means, and gained nothing of what you had led them to expect, and they said, “ Since words fail, try what virtue there is in leaden balls and cold iron.” So human nature always speaks, or we have studied it to no purpose.

When by agitation, by appeals to sentiment and passion, you have worked a people up to that degree of excitement necessary for your purpose, they are no longer under your control, and you must on with them or be crushed by them. It is idle for you to imagine that you can hold them back. Your power over them is in your sympathy with them. No matter how loudly they cheered you yesterday. No matter how eagerly they hang on your words, or run to do your slightest wish ; let the sympathetic cord be broken, let them once feel that you go no farther with them, or that you wish them to stop where they are, you are henceforth to them an enemy, a traitor, and, instead of thanking you for what you have done, they only execrate you for what you withhold. Has not the Holy Father within the last year experienced the truth of this ? He did not

agitate his people ; he found them agitated, wrought up by others to a feverish state of excitement for political reforms. He placed himself in sympathy with them, gave them political reforms, and who ever saw a prince more beloved, a people more submissive, more ready to consult every wish of their sovereign ? A whole year was devoted to feasting and rejoicing in honor of the *Liberal* Pontiff, who loved his people, and knew how to march with the spirit of the age, and at its head. A new era had dawned. The Church had formed an alliance with liberty. Pius the Ninth had baptized Democracy, and placed himself at the head of the European Liberals. How did the welkin ring again with shouts of *Evviva Pio Nono !* Heretics and schismatics, Jews and infidels, refugees and apostates, all joined in the chorus. A few short months go by, and this Roman people, so devout, so loyal, so enthusiastically submissive to their sovereign, remind him gently that there is a little additional reform which would please them very much ; he, as an indulgent father, grants it. *Evviva Pio Nono !* — But, *Santo Padre*, here is one other little reform. It is conceded. *Evviva Pio Nono !* — Demand follows demand till the Holy Father has conceded to the last limit of possible concession, if he is to preserve government at all, and then what do these same people do ? They look quietly on, if nothing worse, and see him imprisoned in his own capital, and virtually stripped of all power as a temporal prince. Has any one been surprised ? Who, accustomed to study popular movements, did not expect, even foretell, as much, when the news of the far-famed *amnesty* reached him ? A short time since Gioberti, the O'Connell of Italy, was all-powerful with the Italian Liberals ; how is it with him now, since he has attempted to restrain their movement within practical bounds ? Alas ! he is in a fair way of being less esteemed by them than the very Jesuits whose expulsion from all Italy, to please them, he has effected. Nay, O'Connell had himself lost the control of the Irish movement, and had he even retained all his early vigor, he could not have continued the tremendous excitement of the Repeal year (1843) within its peaceful limits. His speeches even during that year became warlike, and we listened with breathless expectation to hear him give the command, " Sound to the charge ! " At that point neither he nor the people could remain. And who sees not that he could not use more moderate language, without either undoing all he had done, or placing himself in opposition to the people he had agitated,

and then ceasing to be their leader ? The latter is what actually happened. After 1843, Daniel O'Connell ceased to be the leader of Ireland, and the ceremony that took place in his honor, after his liberation from prison, was only the crowning of the victim for sacrifice.

One thing only has surprised us. The Smith O'Brien party was inevitable, and would have come, either under the lead of O'Connell or in spite of him, let him have done all that mortal man could do to prevent it ; but we were not prepared to find it so small, so insignificant ; and we must believe that the suspension of Repeal agitation in consequence of the arrest and imprisonment of O'Connell and his associates had in some measure abated the excitement of 1843, and that, in fact, the Irish people were far less inflamed than at this distance appeared. Nevertheless, their refusal to engage in the proposed insurrection, and the readiness with which they hearkened to their clergy, is what we did not expect, is, we believe, unexampled in the history of similar movements, and is in the highest degree creditable both to them and to their clergy. It proves that the clergy have not yet lost their influence over the mass of their people, and also that the people are cooler, are less inflammable, have more solid judgment, more prudence and practical good sense, than is commonly supposed. We have seen nothing in their history more noble than their conduct on that trying occasion, nothing that tended more to give us a high idea of their national character, or to inspire us with stronger hopes for their future redemption from slavery and oppression. They almost threw a doubt on the soundness of our doctrine of the dangerousness of the system of agitation, and would half falsify it, if we did not find the foiled agitators and their dupes throwing the fault of their miscarriage on the clergy. Till we saw the Irish refuse, at the direction of their spiritual guides, to embark in Smith O'Brien's insurrection, we had no hopes for Ireland ; now we have no fears for her. We see and appreciate her character more truly, and know that her friends often do her great injustice. We see, also, that St. Patrick still intercedes for his people, and that Almighty God has them in his especial keeping. As long as they are prompt to obey their spiritual guides, nothing can harm them.

But we are extending our remarks to an unreasonable length. The subject is one of great interest, and for us as well as for Irishmen. Indeed, it is an American as well as an Irish subject. Irish politics are discussed here as they are in Ire-

land. We have associations, confederations, and all the machinery for agitation adopted in the mother country. We have newspapers published among us devoted exclusively to Irish interests ; committees and directories are organized by Americans in our larger cities for the management of Irish affairs ; public meetings are held, speeches made, addresses delivered, funds solicited and collected, as if the country were Ireland herself, or, at least, a British colony ; our candidates for public office are interrogated, indirectly at least, as to their views and feelings in relation to Ireland ; and the reputation of Anglo-American Catholics depends with their religious brethren, in no small degree, on the views they take or do not take of Irish politics. It is thus that the question is made an American question, with important bearings on American politics and American social life. It is brought home to our very bosoms and business, and we cannot blink it with safety to ourselves, even if we would. And now, during the lull in Irish agitation, now that both moral force and physical force have failed, at least for the present, is the proper time for discussion, for taking a new observation, and determining the proper course to steer the vessel hereafter. With this view, we have taken up the subject, and thrown out such thoughts as have occurred to us in the course of our reading and reflection on it, for several years. We have thrown them out as suggestions, to go simply for what they are worth. If the friends of Ireland find nothing better, let them be accepted ; if they find and can agree on something better, let them be rejected, and the better adopted. All we want is the real welfare of Ireland, and we shall be satisfied, if that is secured, whether it be secured by means of our suggesting, or by means suggested by others who differ from us. Certain it is, that the great body of the real friends of Ireland cannot be rallied under either of the banners that have heretofore been unfurled, and that, to secure unanimity and concert, a policy somewhat different from O'Connell's and from Smith O'Brien's must now be adopted. We can, as at present informed, see nothing more promising than the course we have suggested. If others can, we shall be happy to surrender to their superior wisdom and better judgment.

But we have nearly lost sight, in following out our own speculations, of the admirable work before us. We intended to make several extracts from it, as specimens of its style and thought, but we have reserved no place for them, — which is the less to be regretted, because before this, we presume, it has

found its way to all our readers, and they have enjoyed it as well as we. The work is not faultless. We have signified, together with our reasons, our dissent from a few important points, which the author appears to us not to have duly considered. As a literary work, it has great merits. Its style is clear, rich, racy, flowing, but somewhat careless, and occasionally inexact ; the characters are, in general, well drawn, but the action is too hurried, and the events are too crowded. The effect is somewhat injured, also, by selecting, as representatives of Protestants, individuals, not worse, indeed, than can be found in actual life, but yet worse than the average of the class they are intended to represent. The faults which are depicted Protestants will ascribe to the individual, not to their system. Ellen O'Donnell is a noble, a high-spirited girl, but we should like her better, if she had more repose of manner, and a little more quiet dignity. The most touching scene to us, and the most true to nature, in the whole book, is the scene before her miserable hovel between Kathleen and Colonel Templeton. It is a scene drawn from nature by a genuine artist. We like Captain O'Brien, a man, a gentleman, and a patriot, but we wish he had been converted before his betrothal to Ellen. We wish the union of Catholic Ireland and Protestant Ireland, intended to be symbolized by the marriage of Ellen O'Donnell and Captain O'Brien, but only by the conversion of the latter, and we wish to make sure of the conversion before we propose the union. There occurs, too, a passage about the "plague spot," which we shall hope to see expunged in the second edition. But, upon the whole, we like *Shandy M'Guire* ; we like it for its fun, we like it for its genuine tenderness and its deep pathos ; we like it for its bold and manly tone, its free and independent spirit, and above all, for its uncompromising Catholicity, which will not abate a single genuflection to please all the heretical kings in Christendom. Thank you, Paul Peppergrass, Esq., for that expression, which, though not to be taken nor intended to be taken to the strict letter, conveys the only sentiment worthy of one who belongs to a church made and directed by God, and not by man. The work cannot fail to do good. It will tend to awaken more manly feelings and induce a more manly bearing in the Irish themselves ; it can hardly fail to elevate the Irish character in the estimation of our community, and to create a more respectful and a more kindly feeling towards our Irish population. It will enable the

American people to account for many of those traits which offend them in the Irish character, and without discredit to the Irish ; it will make them feel that the Irish must be a wonderful people, and richly favored by Divine grace, or they could not be what they are, — could not have retained a single human virtue, a single noble or generous quality. All that malice backed by power and ingenuity could do to brutalize them, and obliterate every trace of the image of God to which they were created, has been done, and yet they remain human, and, in spite of all their faults, in spite of all the objectionable features of their national character, and they are many, they compare in all the nobler moral virtues and religious excellences more than favorably with any other people on the globe. Their worst side is their outside. What is objectionable in their character lies on the surface, and is seen at a glance. Their virtues lie deeper, and are known only after an intimate acquaintance, often are known at all only to Him for whose sake alone they are cultivated. Their vices are in a great measure the result of the condition in which they have been placed, the evasions they have been obliged to study in order to live, the cruelty and contempt with which they have been treated ; their virtues, through Divine grace, are their own, and place them first on the list of nations. They have so prospered spiritually under their temporal adversity, that we almost dread to see them exposed to the temptations of temporal prosperity. They are now fulfilling an important mission in evangelizing the world ; through them, we trust, the revolted Saxon will be reconquered to his allegiance, and great will be their reward in heaven. O, would that our own country enjoyed the riches possessed by Ireland, and could indulge the glorious hopes of her oppressed and earth-abandoned children ! Happy would it be for our boasted and loud-boasting republic ; for what doth it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul ?

ART. IV. — *England the Civilizer ; her History developed in its Principles ; with Reference to the Civilizational History of Modern Europe (America inclusive), and with a View to the Dénouement of the Difficulties of the Hour.* By a Woman. London. Simpkins, Marshall, & Co. January, 1848. 12mo. pp. 470.

THIS handsomely printed volume, written in a gibberish which is neither French nor English, has been sent us "from the author," and we can do no less than acknowledge its reception. It is filled with the wild speculations and demoralizing theories to be expected from "a Woman" who has cast off religion, and, as a necessary consequence, the modesty and delicacy of her sex. In a literary point of view, it is beneath criticism, but it bears the marks of some reading, and even of hard, though ill-directed, thinking. Nature has treated the authoress liberally, and she will have much to answer for. The work could have proceeded only from a strong mind and a corrupt heart.

The work itself pertains to the Socialistic school, and, substantially, to the Fourieristic section of that school. According to it, the human race began its career in ignorance and weakness, and established a false system of civilization. Modern society, dating from the fall of the Western Roman empire, has been engaged in a continual struggle to throw off that system, and to establish a true system in its place. It has been engaged, thus far, in the work of demolition, which it has finally terminated. It has prepared the ground for true civilization, and the human race now stand waiting, or did stand waiting on the first of last January, the signal to introduce it, and to put an end for ever to all evils, moral, social, and physical.

The old civilization, now effete, committed the capital error of recognizing religion, — in the language of the authoress, *superstition*, — government, property, and "the ascendancy of the male sex," or family, — for the family cannot subsist without that ascendancy ; — the new civilization will correct this error, and for religion substitute science ; for government, federation ; for law, instinct ; for property, communal wealth ; for family, love ; and for the ascendancy of the male sex, the administration of women. Consequently, the new civilization is to be a petticoat civilization, in which we must include the human race in those genera which are named after the female, as cows, geese, ducks, hens, &c.

Into the details of this new civilization, or the means by which it is to be introduced and preserved, we need not enter. Some things may be assumed to be settled; if not, the human race can settle nothing, and it is idle to examine the claims of a new theory. If any thing can be settled, it is that the man is the head of the woman, — that she is for him, not he for her; and that religion, government, family, property, are essential elements of all civilization. Without them man must sink below the savage, for in the lowest savage state we find, at least, some reminiscences of them. Any system which proposes their abolition or essential modification is by that fact alone condemned, and proved to deserve no examination. We do the Socialists too much honor when we consent to hear and refute their dreams. We have not at this late day to resettle the basis of society, to seek for unknown truth in religion or politics, in relation to public or domestic, private or social life; we have no new discoveries to make, no important changes to introduce; and all that we need attempt is to ascertain the truth which has been known from the beginning, and to conform ourselves to it.

Nevertheless, the work before us is a pregnant sign of the times, and may afford food for much useful reflection to those prepared to digest it. People who attend to their own business, tread the routine their fathers trod, and attempt to discharge in peace and quiet the practical duties of their state, little suspect what is fermenting in the heated brains of this nineteenth century. They know next to nothing of what is going on around them. They look upon the doctrines contained in works like the one before us as the speculations of a few insane dreamers, and are sure that the good sense of mankind will prevent them from spreading, and confine their mischief to the misguided individuals who put them forth. They regard them as too ridiculous, as too absurd, to be believed. They can do no harm, and we need not trouble our heads about them. This is certainly a plausible view of the subject, but, unhappily, there is nothing too ridiculous or too absurd to be believed, if demanded by the dominant spirit or sentiment of an age or country; for what is seen to be demanded by that spirit or sentiment never appears ridiculous or absurd to those who are under its influence.

Nothing, to a rightly instructed mind, is more ridiculous or absurd than the infidelity which so extensively prevailed in the last century, and which under another form prevails equally in this. Yet when the philosophy which necessarily implied it

first made its appearance, few comparatively took the alarm, and even learned and sound Churchmen were unable to persuade themselves that there was any serious danger to be apprehended. When the philosophers and literary men went farther, and, developing that philosophy, actually made free with the Scriptures, and even the mysteries of faith, the majority of those who should have seen what was coming paid little attention to them, jested at the incipient incredulity with great good humor, felt sure that no considerable number of persons would proceed so far as to deny not only the Church, but the very existence of God, and flattered themselves that the infidelity which was manifest would prove only a temporary fashion, a momentary caprice, which would soon become weary of itself, and evaporate. Nevertheless, all the while, the age was virtually infidel, and thousands of those who had persisted in believing there was no danger were themselves but shortly after driven into exile, or brought to the guillotine by its representatives. The same thing occurs now in regard to Socialism. The great body of those who have faith and sound principles look upon it as the dream of a few isolated individuals, as undeserving a moment's attention, and think it a waste of time and breath even to caution the public against it. Yet in one form or other it has already taken possession of the age, has armed itself for battle, made the streets of Paris, Berlin, Frankfort, Vienna, and other cities, run with blood, and convulsed nearly the whole civilized world. It is organized all through Europe and the United States; scarcely a book, a tract, or a newspaper is issued from a constantly teeming press, that does not favor it, and there is scarcely any thing else going that can raise a shout of applause from the people; and yet we are told, even by grave men, that it is a matter which need excite no apprehension.

Nor is this the worst aspect of the case. Not a few of those who shrink with horror from Socialism, as drawn out and set forth by its avowed advocates, do themselves, unconsciously, adopt and defend the very principles of which it is only the logical development; nay, not only adopt and defend those principles, but denounce, as behind their age, as the enemies of the people, those who call them in question. Have we not ourselves been so denounced? If you doubt it, read the criticisms of *The Boston Pilot* on our review of Padre Ventura's *Oration*, or *The New York Commercial Advertiser's* notice of our censure of the Italian Liberals for their persecution of the

Jesuits. Of course, these papers have no authority of their own, but they echo public opinion, and tell, as well as straws, which way the wind blows. If the public condemned in no measured terms the "horrible doctrines" we a few years since put forth in an *Essay on the Laboring Classes*, it has not condemned, but through some of its leading organs commended, an article on *The Distribution of Property*, published in *The North American Review* for last July, — the most conservative periodical, except our own, in the country, — which defends at length, and with more ability than we ordinarily expect in that Journal, the very principles from which we logically derived them. We hold in utter detestation the doctrines of the *Essay* referred to, and which raised a terrible clamor against us throughout the country ; but we proved, in our defence, and no one has yet, to our knowledge, ventured to maintain the contrary, that those doctrines were only legitimate conclusions from the Protestant and democratic premises held by the great body of our countrymen, and by what they do and must regard as the more enlightened portion of mankind. In fact, a very common objection to us was, that we were ahead of the age, that is, drew the conclusions before the people were ready to receive them. We did but reason logically from the principles we had imbibed from public opinion, from general literature, and the practical teachings of those we had been accustomed from our childhood to hear mentioned with honor, and had been required to revere, — principles which we had never heard questioned, and never thought of questioning, till we undertook to explain to ourselves the universal outcry which had been raised against us. As we found our countrymen saying two and two, we thought we might innocently add, two and two *make four*, and complete the proposition. We were wrong, not in our logic, but in our principles. We had trusted the age ; we had confided in its maxims, and received them as axioms. As the mists cleared away, as the gloss of novelty wore off, and the excitement of self-defence subsided, we saw the horrible nature of the doctrines we had put forth, and recoiled, not only from them, but from the principles of which they were the necessary logical development. But the age has not followed our example. The great body of the people continue to adhere to those principles, and will not suffer them to be questioned.

No doubt, the majority of numbers are as yet unprepared to adopt Socialism as developed by Owen, Fourier, Saint-Simon,

Cabet, Proudhon, or by "A Woman" in the work before us ; but no man who has studied the age can, if he have any tolerable powers of generalization, doubt that Socialistic principles are those now all but universally adopted. They are at the bottom of nearly all hearts, and at work in nearly all minds ; and just in proportion as men acquire courage enough to say not only two and two, two and two, but that two and two *make four*, the age rushes to their practical realization, — accepts their logical developments, however horrible, however impious. There is an invincible logic in society which pushes it to the realization of the last consequences of its principles. In vain do moderate men cry out against carrying matters to extremes ; in vain do practical men appeal to common sense ; in vain do brave men rush before the movement and with their bodies attempt to interpose a barrier to its onward progress. Society no more — nay, less — than individuals recoils from the conclusions which follow logically from premises it holds to be sound and well established. It draws practically those conclusions, with a terrible earnestness, and a despotism that scorns every limitation. On it moves, heedless of what or of whom it may crush beneath the wheels of its ponderous car. Woe to him who seeks to stay its movement ! Social evils grow as it advances, and these it lays to the charge of those who would hold it back, and maintains result only from the fact that it has not yet reached its goal. The reform is not carried far enough. Put on more steam, carry it farther, carry it farther, is the loud cry it raises.

We see this in the Protestant Reformation. The Reformers did not fulfil their promises, did not secure to the people the good they had led them to expect. Everybody saw this, everybody felt it ; for everybody found himself distracted and unsatisfied. What was the inference drawn ? That the Reformers had erred in principle, and that the Reformation could not secure the good promised ? By no means. The people had accepted its principle. The Reform, said they, is good, is just and true ; but it has not been carried far enough ; the Reformers were only half reformed ; they stopped short of the mark. The Reform must not stop with Luther and Calvin ; we must carry it farther. This is what the children of the Reformation said, as we all know ; and they have been from the first struggling to carry it farther and farther, and have at length carried it to the borders, if not into the regions, of nihilism. The evils remain, nay, every day increase, and each day a new party

risers up in the bosom of the most advanced sect, and demands a further advance.

In the political world we see the same thing. Revolution has followed revolution, and no political reform goes far enough to satisfy its friends. In the last century, revolutions were *political*, and had for their object the establishment of political equality, or democracy. It was soon seen that political equality answers no purpose where there is *social* inequality. A writer, who could speak with as much authority on this subject as any of our contemporaries, thus expressed himself in 1841: —

“ But democracy as a form of government, *political* democracy, as we call it, could not be the term of popular aspiration. Regarded in itself, without reference to any thing ulterior, it is no better than the aristocratic form of government, or even the monarchical. Universal suffrage and eligibility, the expression of perfect equality before the state, and which with us are nearly realized, unless viewed as means to an end, are not worth contending for. What avails it, that all men are equal before the state, if they must stop there? If under a democracy, aside from mere politics, men may be as unequal in their social condition as under other forms of government, wherein consist the boasted advantages of your democracy? Is all possible good summed up in suffrage and eligibility? Is the millennium realized, when every man may vote and be voted for? Yet this is all that political democracy, reduced to its simplest elements, proposes. Political democracy, then, can never satisfy the popular mind. This democracy is only one step — a necessary step — in its progress. Having realized equality before the state, the popular mind passes naturally to equality before society. It seeks and accepts *political* democracy only as a means to *social* democracy; and it cannot fail to attempt to realize equality in men's social condition, when it has once realized equality in their political condition.” — *The Boston Quarterly Review*, January, 1841, pp. 113, 114.

Political democracy leaves the principal social evils undressed, and the causes which led the reform thus far remain in all their force to carry it still farther. Hence we see in the present century the same party which in the last demanded political democracy attempting throughout nearly the whole civilized world a series of revolutions in favor of social democracy. The leaders in the late French Revolution tell you that it was a social revolution they sought, and that it was this fact which distinguished it from the Revolution of 1789. In Italy and Germany two revolutions are going on at once, a political revolu-

tion and a social revolution. Young Italy is Socialistic ; so is Young Germany ; and it was its socialistic character that gave to the movement of Ronge and his associates its significance and its moderate success. The race, modern philosophers tell us, is progressive, and in a certain sense we concede it. It tends invariably to reach the end implied in the principles it adopts or the impulse it has received, and that tendency is never self-arrested. Its progress towards that end is irresistible ; and when it happens to be downward, as at present, it is fearfully rapid, and becomes more fearfully rapid in proportion to the distance it descends.

The only possible remedy is, not declamation against the horrible results, the pernicious conclusions, at which the popular mind arrives, — the resource of weak men, — but the correction of the popular premises and recalling the people to sound first principles. Once concede that even political equality is a good, an object worth seeking, you must concede that social equality is also a good ; and social equality is necessarily the annihilation of religion, government, property, and family. The same principle which would justify the Moderate Republicans of France in dethroning the king would justify M. Proudhon in making war on property, declaring every rich man a robber, and seeking to exterminate the *Bourgeoisie*, as these have already exterminated the nobility. There is no stopping-place between legitimacy — whether monarchical or republican legitimacy — and the most ultra Socialism. Once in the career of political reform, — we say *political*, not *administrative*, reform, — we are pledged to pursue it to its last results. We are miserable cowards, or worse, if we shrink from the legitimate deductions from our own premises. There is not a meaner sin than the sin of in consequence, — a sin against our own rational nature which distinguishes us from the mere animal world. If we adopt the Socialistic premises, we must go on with the Socialists in their career of destruction ; nay, we shall be compelled to do so, or strew the battle-field with our dead bodies. If we recoil from the Socialistic conclusions, we must reëxamine our own premises, and reject distinctly, unreservedly, and heroically every Socialistic principle we may have unwittingly adopted, every Socialistic tendency we may have unintentionally cherished.

The people, it is well known, do not discriminate, do not perceive, until it is too late, the real nature and tendency of their principles. They mix up truth and falsehood, and can

hardly ever be made to distinguish the one from the other. They adopt principles which appear to them sound and wholesome, and which under a certain aspect are so, and, unconscious of aiming at what is destructive, they place no confidence in any who tell them they expose themselves to danger. They see no connection between their principles and the conclusions against which we warn them, and which they at present, as well as we, perhaps view with horror ; they therefore conclude that the connection we assert is purely imaginary, that we ourselves are deceived, or have some sinister purpose in asserting it ; that we are wedded to the past, in love with old abuses, because, perhaps, we profit, or hope to profit, by them ; that we do not understand our age, are narrow and contracted in our views, with no love or respect for the poorest and most numerous class. In a word, they set us down as rank conservatives or aristocrats. No age ever comprehends itself, and the people, following its dominant spirit, can never give an account of their own principles. They never trace them out to their last results, and are unable to follow the chain of reasoning by which horrible consequences are linked to premises which appear to them innocent. They never see whither they are going. Democratic philosophers themselves tell us as much, and defend their doctrine on the ground that the people are directed by divine instincts, and obey a wisdom which is not their own. To this effect we may quote the writer already cited, and who, on this point, was among the more moderate of his class. In an article on *Philosophy and Common Sense*, which had the honor to be commended by Victor Cousin, he says : —

“ Philosophy is not needed by the masses : but they who separate themselves from the masses, and who believe that the masses are entirely dependent on them for truth and virtue, need it, in order to bring them back and bind them again to universal Humanity. And they need it now, and in this country, perhaps, as much as ever. The world is filled with commotions. The masses are heaving and rolling, like a mighty river, swollen with recent rains, and snows dissolving on the mountains, onward to a distant and unknown ocean. There are those among us, who stand awe-struck, who stand amazed. What means this heaving and onward rolling ? Whither tend these mighty masses of human beings ? Will they sweep away every fixture, every house and barn, every mark of civilization ? Where will they end ? In what will they end ? Shall we rush before them and attempt to stay their progress ? Or shall we fall into their ranks and on with them to their goal ? ‘ Fall into their ranks ; be not afraid ; be not startled ; a *divine instinct*

*guides and moves onward that heaving and rolling mass ; and lawless and destructive as it may seem to you, ye onlookers, it is normal and holy, pursuing a straight and harmless direction on to the union of Man with God.' So answers philosophy, and this is its glory. The friends of Humanity need philosophy, as the means of legitimating the cause of the people, of proving that it is the right, and the duty, of every man to bind himself to that cause, and to maintain it in good report and in evil report, in life and in death. They need it, that they may prove to these conservatives, who are frightened almost out of their wits at the movements of the masses, and who are denouncing them in no measured terms, that these movements are from God, and that they who war against them are warring against truth, duty, God, and Humanity. They need it, that they may no longer be obliged to make apologies for their devotion to the masses, their democratic sympathies and tendencies. They who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, who are loaded with reproach for their fidelity to truth and duty, who are all but cast out of the pale of Humanity, because they see, love, and pursue Humanity's true interests, — they need it, that they may comprehend the cause of the opposition they meet, forgive their enemies, silence the gainsayer, and give to him that asks it a reason for the hope that is in them. The friends of progress, here and everywhere, need it, that, having vindicated, legitimated progress, as philosophers, they may go into the saloons, the universities, the halls of legislation, the pulpit, and abroad among the people, and preach it, with the dignity and the authority of the prophet." — *The Boston Quarterly Review*, January, 1838, pp. 104, 105.*

It is necessary to take this ground, or give up democracy, which Mr. Bancroft defines "Eternal Justice ruling through the people," as wholly indefensible ; for it cannot be denied that popular movements are blind, and that in them the people are borne onward whither they see not, and by a force they comprehend not. Hence it is easy to understand, that, retaining in their memories traces of former instructions, they may recoil with horror from the last consequences of Socialism, and yet be intent only on developing Socialistic tendencies, and crushing all opposition to them.

Socialism is, moreover, presented in a form admirably adapted to deceive the people, and to secure their support. It comes in a Christian guise, and seeks to express itself in the language of the Gospel. Men whom this age delights to honor have called our blessed Lord "the Father of Democracy," and not few or insignificant are those who tell us that he was "the first Socialist." In this country, the late Dr. Channing took the

lead in reducing the Gospel to Socialism ; and in France, the now fallen Abbé de la Mennais, condemned by Gregory the Sixteenth, of immortal memory, was the first, we believe, who labored to establish the identity of Socialism and Christianity. We gave in another place, in 1840, a brief notice of his views on this point, which it may not be uninteresting to reproduce.

“ The most remarkable feature in the Abbé de la Mennais’s doctrine of liberty is its connection with religion. It is well known, that for some time the friends of freedom in Europe have been opposed to the Church, and in general to all religion. The privileged orders have also taken great pains to make it widely believed, that religion requires the support of existing abuses, and that no one can contend for social meliorations without falling into infidelity. This has created a false issue, one which M. de la Mennais rejects. He has endeavoured, and with signal success, to show that there is no discrepancy between religion and liberty ; nay, more, that Christianity offers a solid foundation for the broadest freedom, and that, in order to be true to its spirit, its friends must labor with all their might to restore to the people their rights, and to correct all social abuses. He proves that all men are equal before God, and therefore equal one to another. All men have one Father, and are therefore brethren, and ought to treat one another as brothers. This is the Christian law. This law is violated, whenever distinction of races is recognized ; whenever one man is clothed with authority over his equals ; whenever one man, or a number of men, are invested with certain privileges, which are not shared equally by the whole. As this is the case everywhere, everywhere therefore is the Christian law violated. Everywhere therefore is there suffering, lamentation. The people everywhere groan and travail in pain, sighing to be delivered from their bondage into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. To this deliverance the people have a right. For it every Christian should contend ; and they wrong their brethren, deny Christianity, and blaspheme God, who oppose it.

This is a new doctrine in France. It is something new since the days of the *philosophes*, to undertake to show that Christianity is the religion which favors not kings and privileged orders, but the people, the poor and needy, the wronged and downtrodden. Hitherto the few have made the many submit to the grievous burdens under which they groaned, by representing it as irreligious to attempt to remove them. They have enlisted the clergy on their side, and made religion, the very essence of which is justice and love, contribute to the support of oppression. They have deterred the pious from seeking to better their condition, by denouncing all who seek the melioration of society as infidels. But the Abbé has put a stop to this unhallowed proceeding. He has nobly vindicated

religion and the people. He has turned the tables upon the people's masters, and denounced their masters, not the people, as infidels. He has enlisted religion on the side of freedom; recalled that long forgotten Gospel, which was glad tidings to the poor, and dared follow the example of Jesus, whom the common people heard gladly, and whom the people's masters crucified between two thieves. He speaks out for freedom, the broadest freedom, not in the tones of the infidel scoffer, but in the name of God, Christ, and man, and with the authority of a prophet. His 'Words of a Believer' has had no parallel since the days of Jeremiah. It is at once a prophecy, a curse, a hymn, fraught with deep, terrible, and joyful meaning. It is the doom of the tyrant, and the jubilee-shout of the oppressed. We know of no work in which the true spirit of Christianity is more faithfully represented. It proclaims, 'Blessed are the poor, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven'; and woe unto the rich oppressor, the royal spoiler, the scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, who bind heavy burdens and lay them on men's shoulders, while they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers." — *The Boston Quarterly Review*, January, 1840, pp. 117–119.

It may not be amiss to place by the side of this bold commendation of the *Words of a Believer*, the judgment pronounced upon that book and its doctrines by the Sovereign Pontiff, in his Encyclical Letter, dated June, 1834, which we find in the *Pièces Justificatives* published by M. de la Mennais at the end of his volume entitled *Affaires de Rome*, Bruxelles, 1837.

"Horruimus sane, venerabiles Fratres, vel ex primo oculorum obtutu, auctorisque cæcitatem miserati intelleximus, quonam scientia prorumpat, quæ non secundum Deum sit, sed secundum mundi elementa. Enimvero contra fidem sua illa declaratione solemniter datam, captiosissimis ipse ut plurimum verborum, fictionumque involucris oppugnandam, evertendamque suscepit catholicam doctrinam, quam memoratis nostris litteris,* tum de debita erga potestates subjectione, tum de arcenda a populis exitiosa *indifferentismi* contagione, deque frenis injiciendis evaganti opinionum sermonumque licentiæ, tum demum de damnanda omnimodo conscientiæ libertate, teterrimaque societatum, vel ex cujuscumque falsæ religionis cultoribus, in sacræ et publicæ rei perniciem conflatarum conspiratione, pro auctoritate humilitati nostræ tradita definivimus.

"Refugit sane animus ea perlegere, quibus ibidem auctor vinculum quodlibet fidelitatis subjectionisque erga principes disrumpere conatur, face undequaque perduellionis immissa, qua publici ordinis

* *Epistola Encyclica*, August 15, 1832.

clades, magistratuum contemptus, legum infractio grassetur, omniaque, et sacræ, et civilis potestatis elementa convellantur. Hinc novo et iniquo commento potestatem principum, veluti divinæ legi infestam, imo *opus peccati* et *Satanæ potestatem* in calumniæ portentum traducit, præsidibusque sacrorum easdem, ac imperantibus turpitudinis notas inurit ob criminum molitionumque fœdus, quò eos somniat inter se adversus populorum jura conjunctos. Neque tanto hoc ausu contentus omnigenam insuper opinionum, sermonum, conscientiæque libertatem obtrudit, militibusque ad eam a *tyrannide*, ut ait, liberandam dimicaturis fausta omnia ac felicia comprecatur, cœtus ac consociationes furiali æstu ex universo qua patet Orbe advocat, et in tam nefaria consilia urgens atque instans compellit, ut eo etiam ex capite monita præscriptaque nostra proculcata ab ipso sentiamus.

“Piget cuncta hic recensere, quæ pessimo hoc impietatis et audaciæ fœtu ad divina humanaque omnia perturbanda congeruntur. Sed illud præsertim indignationem excitat, religionique plane intolerandum est, divinas præscriptiones tantis erroribus adserendis ab auctore afferri, et incautis venditari, eumque ad populos lege obedientiæ solvendos, perindè ac si a Deo missus et inspiratus esset, postquam in sacratissimo Trinitatis augustæ nomine præfatus est, Sacras Scripturas ubique obtendere, ipsarumque verba, quæ verba Dei sunt, ad prava hujuscemodi deliramenta inculcanda callide audacterque detorquere, quo fidentius, uti inquiebat S. Bernardus, *pro luce tenebras offundat, et pro melle vel potius in melle venenum propinet, novum cudens populis Evangelium, aliudque ponens fundamentum præter id quod positum est.*

“Verùm tantam hanc sanæ doctrinæ illatam perniciem silentio dissimulare ab eo vetamur, qui speculatores nos posuit in Israel, ut de errore illos moneamus, quos Auctor et consummator fidei Jesus nostræ curæ concredidit.

“Quare auditis nonnullis ex venerabilibus fratribus nostris S. R. E. cardinalibus, motu proprio, et ex certâ scientia, deque Apostolicæ potestatis plenitudine memoratum librum, cui titulus: *Paroles d'un Croyant*, quo per impium Verbi Dei abusum populi corrumpuntur ad omnis ordinis publici vincula dissolvenda, ad utramque auctoritatem, labefactandam, ad seditiones in imperiis, tumultus, rebellionesque excitandas, fovendas, roborandas, librum ideò propositiones respective falsas, calumniosas, temerarias, inducentes in anarchiam, contrarias Verbo Dei, impias, scandalosas, erroneas jam ab Ecclesia præsertim in Valdensibus, Wiclefitis, Hussitis, aliisque id generis hæreticis damnatas continentem, reprobamus, damnamus, ac pro reprobato et damnato in perpetuum haberi volumus, atque decernimus.

“Vestrum nunc erit, venerabiles Fratres, nostris hisce mandatis, quæ rei et sacræ et civilis salus et incolumitas, necessario efflagitat,

omni contentioni obsecundare, ne scriptum istius modi e latebris ad exitium emissum eò fiat perniciosius, quo magis vesanæ novitatis libidini velificatur, et latè ut cancer serpit in populis. Muneris vestris sit, urgere sanam de tanto hoc negotio doctrinam, vafritiamque novatorum patefacere, acriusque pro Christiani Gregis custodia vigilare, ut studium religionis, pietas actionum, pax publica floreat et augeantur feliciter. Id sane a vestra fide, et ab impensa vestra pro communi bono instantia fidenter operimur, ut, eo juvante qui pater est luminum, gratulemur (dicimus cum S. Cypriano) *fuisse intellectum errorem, et retusum, et ideo prostratum, quia agnitum, atque detectum.*" — pp. 56 – 62.

We hope the judgment of the Holy Father will weigh as much with our readers as that of the Editor of *The Boston Quarterly Review*. We had for a time the unenviable honor of being ranked ourselves among those who attempted here and elsewhere to translate Christianity into Socialism. There are, perhaps, yet living, persons who remember the zeal and perseverance with which we preached, in the name of the Gospel, the most damnable radicalism. We cite a few paragraphs from an essay entitled *Democracy of Christianity*, published in *The Boston Quarterly Review*, October, 1838.

"In a civil and political sense, we cannot discover that the Church regards Christianity in any other light than that of a curb, a bit, a restraint, a means by which the people may be kept in order and in submission to their masters. The clergy, under this point of view, are a sort of constabulary force at the service of the police, and meeting-houses a substitute for police offices, houses of correction, and penitentiaries. Far be it from us to deny the great worth of Christianity in this respect. We acknowledge the virtues of the Church, as an agent of the police; but we hope we may be allowed to believe that Christianity requires the Church to possess other and far higher virtues. It should not merely keep the people in subjection to an order of things which is, but fire them with the spirit and the energy to create a social order, to which it shall need no constabulary force, lay or clerical, to make the millions submissive.

"But if the Church, both here and in Europe, does not desert the cause of Absolutism, and make common cause with the people, its doom is sealed. Its union with the cause of Liberty is the only thing which can save it. The party of the people, the democracy throughout the civilized world, is every day increasing in numbers and in power. It is already too strong to be defeated. Popes may issue their bulls against it; bishops may denounce it; priests may slander its apostles, and appeal to the superstition of the multitude;

kings and nobilities may collect their forces and bribe or dragoon ; but in vain ; IT IS TOO LATE. Democracy has become a power, and sweeps on resistless as one of the great agents of Nature. Absolute monarchs must be swept away before it. They will fail in their mad attempt to arrest the progress of the people, and to roll back the tide of civilization. They will be prostrated in the dust, and rise no more for ever. Whoever or whatever leagues with them must take their fate. If the Altar be supported on the Throne, and the Church joined to the Palace, both must fall together. Would the Church could see this in time to avert the sad catastrophe ! It is a melancholy thing to reflect on the ruin of that majestic temple which has stood so long, over which so many ages have passed, on which so many storms have beaten, and in which so many human hearts have found shelter, solace, and heaven. It is melancholy to reflect on the condition of the people deprived of all forms of worship, and with no altar on which to offer the heart's incense to God the Father. Yet assuredly churchless, altarless, with no form or shadow of worship will the people be, if the Church continue its league with Absolutism. The people have sworn deep in their hearts, that they will be free. They pursue freedom as a Divinity, and freedom they will have, — with the Church if it may be, without the Church if it must be. God grant that they who profess to be his especial servants may be cured of their madness in season to save the Altar !

“The people almost universally identify Christianity with the Church. They cannot reject the Church without seeming to themselves to be rejecting Christianity, and therefore not without regarding themselves as infidels. Will the clergy consent to drive the people into infidelity ? Can they not discern the signs of the times ? Will they persist in maintaining social doctrines more abhorrent to the awakening instincts of the people than atheism itself ? A people, regarding itself as infidel, is in the worst plight possible to pursue the work of social regeneration. It is then deprived of the hallowed and hallowing influence and guidance of the religious sentiment ; and it can hardly fail to become disorderly in the pursuit of order, and to find license instead of liberty, and anarchy instead of a popular government. For its own sake, then, and for the sake of liberty also, the Church should break its league with the despots and join with the people, and give them its purifying and ennobling influence.

“The Church must do this or die. Already is it losing its hold on the hearts of the people. Everywhere is there complaint of men's want of interest in religion ; everywhere is there need of most extraordinary efforts, and various and powerful machinery, to bring people into the Church, and few are brought in, save women and children. The pulpit has ceased to be a power. Its voice no

longer charms or kindles. It finds no echo in the universal heart. Sermons are thought to be dull and vapid; and when they call forth applause, it is the preacher that wins it, not the cause he pleads. Are we at any loss to account for this? The old doctrines, the old maxims, the old exhortations, the old topics of discussion, which the clergy judge it their duty to reproduce, are not those which now most interest the people. The dominant sentiment of the people is not what it was. Once it was thought that the earth was smitten with a curse from God, and happiness was no more to be looked for *on* it than *from* it. Then all thoughts turned to another world, and the chief inquiry was, how to secure it. To save the soul from hell hereafter was then the one thing needful; and the preacher, who could show how that was to be done and heaven secured, was sure to be listened to. It is different now. Men think less of escaping hell, have less fear of the Devil, more faith in the possibility of improving their earthly condition, and are more in earnest to extinguish the fires of that hell which has been burning here ever since the fall. The Church must conform to the new state of things. She cannot bring back the past. Yesterday never returns. If she would have her voice responded to, she must speak in tones that shall harmonize with the dominant sentiment of the age. *She must preach democracy*, and then will she wake an echo in every heart, and call forth a response from the depths of the universal soul of Humanity. *She can speak with power only when she speaks to the dominant sentiment, and command love and obedience only when she commands that which the people feel, for the time at least, to be the one thing needful.*

“In calling upon the Church, by which term we mean especially the clergy of all communions, to associate with the democracy, and to labor for the realization of that equality towards which the people are everywhere tending, we seem to ourselves to be merely recalling the Church to Christianity. We freely acknowledge the past services of the Church. She has done much, and done nobly. She has protected the friendless, fed the orphan, raised up the bowed-down, and delivered him who was ready to perish. She has tamed the ruthless barbarian, infused into his heart the sentiment of chaste love, and warmed him with admiration for the generous and humane; she has made kings and potentates, who trample on their brethren without remorse, and lord it without scruple over God’s heritage, feel that there is a power above them, and that throne and diadem, sceptre and dominion, shall avail them naught in presence of the King of kings, before whom they must one day stand and be judged, as well as the meanest of their slaves; she has done a thousand times over more good for the human race than we have space or ability to relate, and blessings on her memory! eternal gratitude to God for that august assembly of saints, martyrs, and

heroes, which she has nourished in her bosom, and sent forth to teach the world, by their lives, the divinity there is in man, one day to be awakened and called forth in its infinite beauty and omnipotent energy !

“ But while we say this, we feel that the Church now, in both its Catholic and Protestant divisions, is unconscious of its mission, and has become false to its great Founder. Jesus was, under a political and social aspect, *the prophet of the democracy*. He came to the poor and afflicted, to the wronged and the outraged, to the masses, the downtrodden millions ; and he spoke to them as a brother, in the tones of an infinite love, an infinite compassion, while he thundered the rebukes of Heaven against their oppressors. ‘ Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers,’ says he to the people’s masters, ‘ how can ye escape the damnation of hell ? ’ His word was with power. Ay, was it, because he spoke to the common soul, because he spoke out for outraged Humanity, and because he did not fear to speak to the great, the renowned, the rich, the boastingly religious, in terms of terrible plainness and severity. Before his piercing glance earth-born distinctions vanish, and kings and princes, scribes and Pharisees, chief priests and elders, sink down below the meanest fisherman, or the vilest slave, and become less worthy to enter the kingdom of heaven than publicans and harlots. Their robes and widened phylacteries, their loud pretensions, their wealth, rank, refinement, influence, do not deceive him. He sees the hollow heart within them, the whited sepulchres they are, full of dead men’s bones and all manner of uncleanness, vessels merely washed on the outside, all filthy within, and he denounces them in terms too terrible to be repeated. Here was the secret of his power. The great, the honored, the respectable, the aristocracy, social or religious, beheld in him a fearful denouncer of their oppressions, a ruthless unveiler of their hidden deformity ; while the poor, the ‘ common people,’ saw in him a friend, an advocate, a protector, ay, an avenger.

“ Jesus declared that the spirit of the Lord was upon him, because he was anointed to preach the Gospel to the poor ; and he gave, when asked by the disciples of John, the fact, that the Gospel was preached to the poor, as one of the principal proofs of his Messiahship. He chose his disciples from the lowest ranks of his countrymen ; and they were the common people who heard him gladly. Was he not a prophet from God to the masses ? Was he, a prophet to them merely because he prepared the way for their salvation hereafter ? Say it not. The earth he came to bless ; on the earth he came to establish a kingdom ; and it was said of him that he should not fail nor be discouraged till he had set judgment, — justice, — in the earth and the isles waited for his law. He was to bring forth victory unto truth. In his days the earth was to be

blest; under his reign all the nations were to be at peace; the sword was to be beaten into the ploughshare and the spear into the pruning-hook; and war was to be no more. The wolf and the lamb were to lie down together, and they were not to hurt or destroy in all the holy mountain of the Lord. The wilderness was to rejoice and blossom as the rose, and the solitary place was to be glad. Every man was to sit under his *own* vine and fig-tree, with none to molest or to make afraid. On the earth was he to found a new order of things, to bring round the blissful ages, and to give to renovated man a foretaste of heaven. It was here, then, the millions were to be blessed with a heaven, as well as hereafter.”* — pp. 464 – 469.

Our readers, if they have perused this extract, will have no trouble to understand why we have, in our present journal, shown ourselves so sensitive to even the appearance of an alliance of the Church with the popular movements of the day. Such an alliance we found De la Mennais contending for, and had ourselves contended for with a distinctness and earnestness equal to his for many years prior to our conversion.

The general doctrine asserted in this last extract was not peculiar to the writer cited. He was never remarkable for his originality. He was remarkable, if for any thing, only for the care with which he studied the movement party of our times, seized its great principles, and abandoned himself to their direction. He accepted that party, and followed it, with a courage and a perseverance worthy of a better cause. The views he put forth were those of his party. They were not peculiar to him then, and they are far less so now. During the last

* The Christian reader will not fail to perceive that the writer here, in his blindness, takes precisely the view which was taken by the carnal Jews, for which they were cursed. Truly, there is nothing new under the sun. The old carnal Jews misinterpreted the prophecies; they expected in the Messiah that was to come a temporal prince, who was to found a temporal kingdom, for the temporal happiness of mankind. They rejected and crucified our Saviour, because he did not come as such a prince, because he proposed a spiritual kingdom, and the spiritual welfare of his subjects. The *Christian* Socialists do the same. They interpret the promises precisely as they were interpreted by the carnal Jews, — expect from our Lord, like them, a temporal kingdom, and precisely the same order of prosperity, — and reject the Church as antichristian, precisely because she, like her Master, proposes for her children the virtues and happiness of the spiritual order. So the progress of the age consists solely in bringing its master spirits round to the point of view of the carnal Jews, to join with them in crucifying their God between two thieves! The sects will generally be found to be wedded to the carnal just in proportion as they fancy they have become spiritual.

ten or twelve years they have made fearful progress, both at home and abroad. Affecting to be Christian, their advocates invoke the name of Jesus, and appeal to the Holy Scriptures, the texts of which, with a perverse ingenuity, they accommodate to their Socialistic purpose. May Almighty God forgive us the share we had in propagating what we called the *Democracy of Christianity*! We have nothing to palliate our offence or to hide our shame; for, if we knew no better at the time, we might have known better, and our ignorance was culpable. All we can say is, we followed the dominant sentiment of the age, which is a poor excuse for one who professed to be a preacher of the Gospel.

Veiling itself under Christian forms, attempting to distinguish between Christianity and the Church, claiming for itself the authority and immense popularity of the Gospel, denouncing Christianity in the name of Christianity, discarding the Bible in the name of the Bible, and defying God in the name of God, Socialism conceals from the indiscriminating multitude its true character, and, appealing to the dominant sentiment of the age and to some of our strongest natural inclinations and passions, it asserts itself with terrific power, and rolls on in its career of devastation and death with a force that human beings, in themselves, are impotent to resist. Men are assimilated to it by all the power of their own nature, and by all their reverence for religion. Their very faith and charity are perverted, and their noblest sympathies and their sublimest hopes are made subservient to their basest passions and their most grovelling propensities. Here is the secret of the strength of Socialism, and here, too, is the principal source of its danger.

The open denial of Christianity is not now to be dreaded; the incredulity of the last century is now in bad taste, and can work only under disguise. All the particular heresies which human pride or human perversity could invent are now effete or unfashionable. Every article in the Creed has been successively denied, and the work of denial can go no farther. The attempt to found a new sect on the denial of any particular article of faith would now only cover its authors with ridicule. The age laughs at Protestantism, and scorns sectarianism. The spirit that works in the children of disobedience must, therefore, affect to be Christian, more Christian than Christianity itself, and not only Christian, but *Catholic*. It can manifest itself now, and gain friends, only by acknowledging the Church and all Catholic symbols, and substituting for the divine and

heavenly sense in which they have hitherto been understood a human and earthly sense. Hence the religious character which Socialism attempts to wear. It rejects in name no Catholic symbol; it only rejects the Catholic sense. If it finds fault with the actual Church, it is because she is not truly Catholic, does not understand herself, does not comprehend the profound sense of her own doctrines, fails to seize and expound the true Christian idea as it lay in the mind of Jesus, and as this enlightened age is prepared to receive it. The Christian symbol needs a new and a more Catholic interpretation, adapted to our stage in universal progress. Where the old interpretation uses the words God, Church, and Heaven, you must understand Humanity, Society, and Earth; you will then have the true Christian idea, and bring the Gospel down to the order of nature and within the scope of human reason. But while you put the human and earthly sense upon the old Catholic words, be careful and retain the words themselves. By taking care to do this, you can secure the support of the adherents of Christianity, who, if they meet their old familiar terms, will not miss their old, familiar ideas; and thus you will be able to reconcile the old Catholic world and the new, and to go on with Humanity in her triumphant progress through the ages.

Since it professes to be Christian, and really denies the faith, Socialism is a heresy; and since by its interpretation it eviscerates the Catholic system of its entire meaning, it is the *résumé* of all the particular heresies which ever have been or can be. The ingenuity of men, aided by the great Enemy of souls, can invent no further heresy. All possible heresies are here summed up and actualized in one universal heresy, on which the age is proceeding with all possible haste to erect a counterfeit Catholicity for the reception and worship of Antichrist as soon as he shall appear in person.

“Descend,” says De la Mennais, “to the bottom of things, and disengage from the wavering thoughts, vain and fleeting opinions, accidentally mingled with it, the powerful principle which, without interruption, ferments in the bosom of society, and what find you but Christianity itself? What is it the people wish, what is it they claim, with a perseverance that never tires, and an ardor that nothing can damp? Is it not the abolition of the reign of force, in order to substitute that of intelligence and right? Is it not the effective recognition and social realization of equality, inseparable from liberty, the necessary condition and essential form of which, in the organization of the state, is election, the first basis of the Christian community?”

“What, again, do the people wish? what do they demand? The amelioration of the lot of the masses, everywhere so full of suffering; laws for the protection of labor, whence may result a more equitable distribution of the general wealth; that the few shall no longer exercise an exclusive influence for their own profit in the administration of the interests of all; that a legislation which has no bounds, the everlasting refuge of privilege, which it in vain attempts to disguise under lying names, shall no longer, on every side, drive the poor back into their misery; that the goods, destined by the Heavenly Father for all his children, shall become accessible to all; that human fraternity shall cease to be a mockery, and a word without meaning. In short, suscitated by God to pronounce the final judgment upon the old social order, they have summoned it to appear, and recalling the ages which have crumbled away, they have said to it, ‘I was hungry, and ye gave me not to eat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me not to drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison, and ye did not visit me.’ I interrogate you on the law. Respond. And the old social order was silent, for it had nothing to answer; and it raised its hand against the people whom God has appointed to judge it. But what can it do against the people, and against God? Its doom is registered on high, and it will not be able to efface it with the blood which, for a brief period, it is permitted to shed.

“We cannot, then, but recognize in what is passing under our eyes the action of the *Christian principle*, which, having for long ages presided almost exclusively over individual life, seeks now to produce itself under a more general and perfect form, to incarnate itself, so to speak, in social institutions, — the second phase of its development, of which only the first labor as yet appears. *Something instinctive and irresistible pushes the people in this direction.* The few have taken possession of the earth; they have taken possession of it by wresting from all others even the smallest part of the common heritage; and the people will that men live as brothers according to the Divine commandment. They battle for justice and charity; they battle for the doctrine which Jesus Christ has come to preach to the world, and which will save it in spite of the powers of the world.” — *Affaires de Rome*, pp. 319 – 321.

This is as artful as it is bold. It wears a pious aspect, it has divine words on its lips, and almost unction in its speech. It is not easy for the unlearned to detect its fallacy, and the great body of the people are prepared to receive it as Christian truth. We cannot deny it without seeming to them to be warring against the true interests of society, and also against the Gospel of our Lord. Never was heresy more subtle, more adroit, better fitted for success. How skilfully it flatters the

people ! It is said, the saints shall judge the world. By the change of a word, the people are transformed into saints, and invested with the saintly character and office. How adroitly, too, it appeals to the people's envy and hatred of their superiors, and to their love of the world, without shocking their orthodoxy or wounding their piety ! Surely Satan has here, in Socialism, done his best, almost outdone himself, and would, if it were possible, deceive the very elect, so that no flesh should be saved.

What we have said will suffice to show the subtle and dangerous character of Socialism, and how, although the majority may recoil from it at present, if logically drawn out by its bolder and more consistent advocates, the age may nevertheless be really and thoroughly Socialistic. We know that the age seeks with all its energy, as the greatest want of mankind, political and social reforms. Of this there is and can be no doubt. Analyze these reforms and the principles and motives which lead to them, which induce the people in our days to struggle for them, and you will find at the bottom of them all the assumption, that *our good lies in the natural order, and is not attainable by individual effort*. All we see, all we hear, all we read, from whatever quarter it comes, serves to prove that this is the deep and settled conviction of the age. If it were not, these revolutions in France, Italy, Germany, and elsewhere, would have no meaning, no principle, no aim, and would be as insignificant as drunken rows in the streets of our cities.

But the essence of Socialism is in this very assumption, that our good lies in the natural order, and is unattainable by individual effort. Socialism bids us follow nature, instead of saying with the Gospel, Resist nature. Placing our good in the natural order, it necessarily restricts it to temporal goods, the only good the order of nature can give. For it, then, evil is to want temporal goods, and good is to possess them. But, in this sense, evil is not remediable or good attainable by individual effort. We depend on nature, which may resist us, and on the conduct of others, which escapes our control. Hence the necessity of social organization, in order to harmonize the interests of all with the interest of each, and to enable each by the union of all to compel Nature to yield him up the good she has in store for him. But all men are equal before God, and, since he is just, he is equal in regard to all. Then all have equal rights, — an equal right to exemption from evil, and an equal right to the possession of good. Hence the social organization must be

such as to avert equal evil from all, and to secure to each an equal share of temporal goods. Here is Socialism in a nutshell, following as a strictly logical consequence from the principles or assumptions which the age adopts, and on which it everywhere acts. The systems drawn out by Owen, Fourier, Saint-Simon, Cabet, Proudhon, or others, are mere attempts to realize Socialism, and may or may not be ridiculous and absurd ; but that is nothing to the purpose, if you concede their principle. These men have done the best they could, and you have no right to censure them, as long as you agree with them in principle, unless you propose something better.

Now we agree with De la Mennais, that Christianity has a political and social character, and with the editor of *The Boston Quarterly Review*, that Christianity seeks the good of man in this life as well as in the life to come. We say with all our heart, "On the earth was he [our Lord] to found a new order of things, to bring round the blissful ages, and to give to renovated man a foretaste of heaven. It was here the millions were to be blessed with a heaven, as well as hereafter." No doubt of it. But *in* the new order and *by* it, — not out of it and independently of it. Out of the new order and independently of it, the millions are, to say the least, no better off than if it did not exist, and have no right to any portion of its blessings. The Socialists, when they attempt to press Christianity into their service, are bad logicians. They are right when they tell us that our Lord came to found a new order of things, for he certainly did come for that purpose ; they are right when they tell us that it is Christian to seek a heaven on earth for the millions, for there is a Christian heaven here for all men, if they choose to accept it ; but when they say this, they are bound to add that this heaven is in the new order established, and is to be sought in it, and by obedience to its principles. It is Christian to seek that order of happiness which Christianity proposes, by the means it prescribes ; but to seek another order of happiness, and by other means, is not *therefore* necessarily Christian, and may even be antichristian. Here is the point they overlook, and which vitiates all their reasoning.

Let no one say that we allege that man must forego any good while in this world in order to gain heaven hereafter. It would be no great hardship, even if it were so ; but our God deals much more liberally with us, and requires us to give up, in order to secure heaven hereafter, only what makes our misery here. The Socialist is right in saying that there is good for us even

in this world ; his error lies in placing that good in the natural order, and in making it unattainable by individual effort. Our good lies not in the natural order, but in the supernatural order, — in that new order which our Lord came to establish. In that order there is all the good we can conceive, and attainable by simple voluntary efforts. Out of that order there is no good attainable either by the efforts of individuals or by association, because out of it there is no good at all. Temporal goods, giving to the term the fullest possible sense, are not good, and, sought for themselves, are productive only of evil. Here is the first error of the Socialists. No evil is removable, no good is attainable, as long as any earthly or merely natural end is held to be, for its own sake, a legitimate object of pursuit. There is and can be good for no one, here or hereafter, save in seeking, *exclusively*, the end for which Almighty God has intended us, and by the means and in the way he himself has appointed. Now this end is neither in this world nor of this world, neither in nature nor of nature, and therefore can be gained, can be promoted, by no natural effort, by no natural means, — neither by political changes nor by social changes, neither by political democracy nor by social democracy. These things have and can have no necessary connection with it. It is a mistake, then, to regard them, in themselves, as ever in any degree desirable.

The Socialists are right when they say that the Christian law is the law of liberty, but not therefore necessarily right when they term the movements of the people for what they call liberty Christian movements, originating in Christian principle. Undoubtedly, the Christian law is the law of liberty. Our Saviour came to free us from bondage, and whom he makes free is free indeed. In the order he establishes, our highest good, our only good, whether for time or eternity, is entirely independent of the world. Nothing in the universe can hinder us, against our will, from attaining to it. We have only to will it and it is ours, and we are always and everywhere free to will. No one depends on nature or other men for the power to fulfil his destiny, — to gain the end for which he was intended. Here is the Christian doctrine of liberty, the glorious liberty which our religion reveals, and which we know by divine faith is no deception. But the liberty the Socialists commend, and which the people are seeking, is not Christian liberty, for it is not liberty at all. Socialism, by its very principle, enslaves us to nature and society, and subjects us to all the fluctuations

of time and sense. According to it, man can attain to true good, can gain the end for which he was made, only in a certain political and social order, which it depends on the millions, whom the individual cannot control, to construct, and which, when constructed, may prove to be inconvenient and inadequate, and require to be pulled down and built up again. The individual, it teaches us, can make no advance towards his destiny but in proportion as he secures the coöperation of his race. All men must be brought down or brought up to the same level before I can go to the end for which my God made me ; each man's true good is unattainable, till all men are prepared to take "a pull, a strong pull, a long pull, and a pull altogether," to attain theirs ! This is slavery, not liberty. Nay, it denies the possibility of liberty, and makes slavery the necessary condition of all men. Is not he a slave who is chained to nature for his good, or to a social organization which does not exist, and which depends on the wisdom, the folly, the passions or instincts, the whims or caprices of other men to create or to destroy ? Who can deny it ? He only is free, he only knows what freedom is, who tramples the world beneath his feet, who is independent of all the accidents of time and space, of all created beings, and who has but to will and all heaven is his, and remains his, though the entire universe fall in ruins around him.

Undoubtedly, Christianity requires us to remove all evil, and in seeking to remove evil we follow the Christian principle ; but what the Socialists call evil, and the people in revolt are seeking to remove, is not evil. Nothing is evil but that which turns a man away from his end, or interposes a barrier to his advance towards it. Nothing but one's own sin can do that. Nothing, then, but sin is or can be evil, and that is evil only to him who commits it. Take all these things which Socialists declaim against, — monarchy, aristocracy, inequalities of rank, inequalities of riches, poverty, want, distress, hunger, starvation even, — not one of them, in itself considered, is necessarily evil ; not one of them, nor all of them combined, can harm the just man, or prevent, except by his own will, any one from the fulfilment of his destiny. If one is prepared to die, he may as well die in a hovel as a palace, of hunger as a fever. Nothing can harm us that does not separate or tend to separate us from God. Nothing but our own internal malice can so separate us, and it is always in our power, through grace, which is never withheld, to remove that at will.

Undoubtedly, also, Christianity requires us to seek not only

to remove evil, but to promote good, and good in this world. Good is the object of the will, and we are always to propose it. But the things the people in their insurrectionary movements are seeking after, and which Socialists commend, are not necessarily good. As there is no evil to the just, so is there no good to the sinner, while he continues in his sinful state. If the Socialists could secure to all men every thing they promise or dream of, they would secure them nothing to their advantage. Place every man at the highest social level that you can conceive ; give him the most finished education you can devise ; lavish on him in profusion this world's goods ; lodge him in the most splendid palace that genius can construct, furnished in the most tasteful and luxurious manner ; let him be surrounded by the most beautiful scenes of nature and the choicest specimens of art ; and let him have ample leisure and opportunity for travel, for social intercourse, and for the fullest and most harmonious development of all his natural faculties ;—you advance him not the millionth part of a hair's-breadth towards his destiny, avert from him no evil, secure him no conceivable good. It will be no consolation to the damned to recollect, that, while here, they were clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day ; and your rich men, your great and renowned men, your fine gentlemen and ladies, with their polished manners and fashionable dresses, their soft complexions and gentle speech, your accomplished artists, your brilliant poets, your eloquent orators, your learned scholars, your profound and subtle philosophers, as well as coarse artisans, ragged beggars, cross-grained old hags, and country bumpkins, will be damned, eternally damned, if they die without the grace of God ; and that grace is as likely to find its way to the hovel as to the palace, to dwell beneath the beggar's gabardine as the embroidered mantle of the rich and refined. The bulk of the strong-minded and thrifty citizens of this republic, with all their political franchises, social advantages, universities, academies, common schools, meeting-houses, external decorum, and material prosperity, are infinitely more destitute than those Neapolitan lazzaroni whose lot they deplore, and are in no rational sense one whit better off than the miserable miners and degraded populace of Great Britain. Their possessions will add nothing to the fulness of their joy, if, by a miracle of mercy, they gain heaven, and will only render fiercer the flames of their torment, if they are doomed to hell, as they have every reason to fear will be the case.

The Socialists fall into the fallacy of passing, in their reason-

ing, from one species to another. Nothing they call evil is evil ; nothing they call good is good ; and hence, because Christianity commands us to remove evil and seek good, it does not follow that we must associate with the disaffected populations to bring about political and social reforms. All that is in any sense good or worth having the individual can always, under any political or social order, secure by a simple effort of his will. Forms of government and forms of social organization, then, are at best indifferent ; Socialism is a folly, and Socialists fools. The Creator is good, and Providence is wise and just. All external events take place by the express appointment of God. If, then, a single event were evil or the occasion of evil to a single individual, save through that individual's own fault, the goodness of the Creator would be denied, and the wisdom and justice of Providence could not be asserted. No doubt, there is evil in the world, far more heart-rending, far more terrific, than Socialists depict, or even conceive ; but to no man is there or can there be evil, but his own sin, which is purely his own creation. Since no man is obliged or compelled to sin, since sufficient grace is given unto every man to enable him to break off from sin and to become just, every man can, as far as himself is concerned, put an end to all evil, and secure all good, even the supreme good itself, at any moment he pleases. Nothing, then, is more idle than to pretend that political and social reforms — touching the organization of the state or of society, we mean, not those which touch administration — are or ever can be necessary as the condition of averting any evil or procuring any good.

We agree, as we have said, that our Lord came to found a new order of things, — new in relation to that which obtained among the heathen, — and that he contemplated the good of the millions here as well as hereafter ; we agree, nay, we hold, that he did propose the amelioration of the lot of man even while in this world, — and not of one class only, but of all classes. But how ? By his new order, or, irrespective of it, merely by calling upon the people themselves to do it through political and social organization ? If you say the latter, you place him in the old order, and class him with the old heathen philosophers. If he asserts simply man's dependence on nature and social organization, he founds no new order, for this dependence was the precise basis of the old order. Mankind always had nature and social organization, and to tell them to look to these for their good was to tell them nothing new ; for this was precisely

what they had done, and were doing. The evil which oppressed the millions was in this very dependence, and what was needed was deliverance from it, — some method, so to speak, of attaining our true good in spite of nature and of social organization. If, then, he retains that dependence, and does not provide this method, what did he do, or what can he do, which a heathen philosopher might not have done? and wherein is what you call the Christian order different from Heathenism? You say, he came to found a new order for the amelioration of mankind; but how can you say this, if you are to look for the amelioration, which you say he authorizes you to seek, not from any new order, but from nature and social organization, which is precisely what the heathen themselves did?

If you say, on the other hand, as you must, if you assert the new order at all, that our Lord ameliorates the lot of mankind *by* his new order, then you must concede that it is only in and through that order that the amelioration is to be effected. Then you are to look for it only as you come into and conform to that order. Now, according to that order, the millions are to be blessed, are to find their true happiness, not in following nature, but in resisting it, — not in possessing temporal goods, but in renouncing them, — not in pride and luxury, but in humility, poverty, and mortification, — not in being solicitous for what we shall eat, or what we shall drink, or wherewith we shall be clothed, “for after all these things do the heathen seek” (St. Matt. vi. 31–34), — in a word, not in seeking any of these things, but in seeking first, that is, as the end of all seeking, the kingdom of God, and his justice, and then “all these things shall be added unto us.” This is the order which our Lord has established. He gives us all needed grace to come into this order and to comply with all its demands, and, if we come in and so comply, he promises us all good, a hundred fold in this world, and everlasting life in the world to come.

Now, as you concede that our Lord came to establish a new order of things, and must concede, that, if he blesses the millions at all, it must be in and by this new order, you are bound to admit that it is only by complying with its requisitions and placing ourselves under its influence, that our good in this world, as well as in the next, is attainable. Then all your efforts by political and social changes, which imply a recurrence to the old order, a reliance on the principles of the heathen world, can only remove you farther and farther from your true God. The only way to attain that good must be to begin by an act of

renunciation, the renunciation of heathenism, of the world, of self, or, what is the same thing, an act of unconditional surrender of ourselves to God. This, if you admit Christianity at all, is the indispensable condition of all good. The heathen sought their good from nature and social organization, and found only evil. We are to seek not even our own good, that is, for the reason that it is *our* good, but God himself, and God alone, and then we shall find our good in Him who is the sovereign good itself. No doubt, this complete renunciation of self is any thing but pleasing to self ; but we are never required to do it in our own strength. God always gives us grace to make it easy, if we will accept it. Moreover, we are required, in this, to do, at least, no more for God than he has done for us. We are required to give up all for him. But he gave up all for us. He made himself man, took upon himself the form of a servant, became poor, and obedient unto death, even unto the death of the cross, for us ; and can we not, therefore, give up ourselves for him, especially when what we give up it were an injury to us to hold back ? If we give ourselves to him, he gives himself to us. He can give no more than himself, and can we ask or expect more than an infinite God can give ? Here is the condition, and it is only, under the order God has established, by complying with this condition that there is good for us here or hereafter ; and we know, also, that, by complying, all evil is removed, and all conceivable and more than all conceivable good is obtained. The true course to be taken, then, is perfectly plain, and may be taken without hesitation ; for He who has promised is able to fulfil, and will keep his word.

Of course we do not pretend, that, by conforming to the Christian order, the political and social equality contended for will be obtained ; we do not pretend that there will be no more pain, no more sorrow, no more poverty, no more hunger or thirst. These things will remain, no doubt, as facts ; but we have shown that they are not necessarily evils, and that their removal is not necessarily a good. These things have their uses in this world, or they would not be suffered to exist. To the just they are mercies, salutary penance, or occasions of merit, — purging the soul from the stains of past transgressions, or giving it an occasion to rise to higher sanctity and a higher reward. To the sinner they may be the occasion of evil ; but, if so, only because he does not receive them in a proper disposition, and because by his malice he refuses to profit by them. But even to him they are no more hurtful than their opposites, — often

not so hurtful. By conforming to the Christian order, all so-called temporal evils, in so far as evil, are removed, and all so-called temporal goods, in so far as good, are secured ; and this is all that can be asked.

But we are told, this is all, no doubt, very well, very true, very pious ; but the age does not believe it, the people will not receive it. The people demand political and social reforms ; and we must conform ourselves to their state of mind, or we can have no influence with them. Let the Church sanction them in their movements for liberty, equality, and brotherhood, and then they will listen to her teaching, and profit by it.

If there is any truth in this, it proves what we have all along been endeavouring to establish, — that the age is Socialistic, and that Socialism is unchristian, nay, antichristian. Those, then, who urge the Church to make an alliance with the people in their movements, to baptize Socialism, and even give it Holy Communion, or who suppose they can without detriment to religion sympathize with these movements, we leave to defend themselves, as best they may. We have no skill to frame an apology for them, unless it be that they cherish the spirit of the age instead of the spirit of the Church, which is only a condemnation.

But suppose the sanction involved no violation of principle, and suppose the Church should make common cause with the so-called movement party, and enable it to effect the reforms it attempts, — what would be gained ? These reforms, if effected, would content nobody, and a new series of reforms would be attempted, in their turn to be found equally unsatisfactory, and thus on *in infinitum*, — reforms giving birth to new reforms, bringing no relief, producing and perpetuating endless confusion, to the contentment, the satisfaction of nobody, but the arch enemy of mankind.

The Church is not of this world, and her principles are not those which govern the princes or the people of this world. She is the Spouse of God in this world, the mother of the faithful, the teacher of truth, and the dispenser of the Bread of Life to all who will receive it. They who are nursed with the milk from her bosom, who receive the Bread of Life from her hands and eat thereof, shall never hunger or thirst, shall never die, but shall live for ever. All she asks of governments and social institutions is that they leave her free, that is, violate in their administration no law of God. If the people grow discontented with the material order they find existing, she ex-

pounds to them the law ; if in violation of the law, as she expounds it, they still persevere, and introduce a new order, be it what it may, she does not desert them ; she continues to present herself in her divine character before them, and to discharge for them her sacred mission. She has truly a maternal heart, and seeks always and everywhere the true good of the people for time and for eternity ; but she knows that Almighty God has made their good possible only on one condition, and therefore on that one condition she must insist. She explains it to the people, she exhorts and entreats them with divine tenderness to comply with it ; but if they regard themselves as wiser than she, refuse to comply with the indispensable condition proposed, and will return to the old heathen order and seek their good from nature and human society, instead of seeking it from God and his Church, she grieves over them as our Lord grieved over Jerusalem devoted to destruction, but she can do no more. Their sin is on their own head, and they must reap the fruit of their own sowing. Themselves they may destroy, — her they cannot harm.

Here the discussion of our subject properly closes ; but we fear that without additional remarks we may be misapprehended. These are times of jealousy, suspicion, and great uncharitableness, when men's passions are inflamed, and their heads more than ordinarily confused. What we say on one subject we are in danger of having understood of another ; and because we oppose certain popular tendencies, they who cherish them will allege that we are the enemies of the people, opposed to political and social amelioration, and solicitous only to maintain the reign of injustice and brute force, — than which nothing is or can be farther from the truth. Because we assert that our good lies solely in the Christian order and is always and everywhere attainable at will, and therefore deny the necessity or the utility of political and social changes as a means of bettering our condition, the same persons will endeavour to bring us into conflict with the Holy Father, who, according to them, is a *Liberal Pontiff*, a sort of *Socialistic Pope*, opposed to monarchy, in favor of popular institutions, taking the side of the people against their rulers, and sanctioning the principle of their movements, by granting a constitutional government to his immediate temporal subjects. A few words to clear up this matter will not be unnecessary.

We have no occasion to make a profession of our respect

for the Papal authority ; for the doctrine of this journal on that subject is well known. If that authority is in any instance against us, it is sufficient to convince us that we are wrong ; and it is against us in the present instance, if the view given of Pius the Ninth be the just one. But that view has no authority, except the childish fears of one party and the unhallowed wishes of another. Pius the Ninth is a noble-minded and generous-hearted man, an enlightened prince, an humble and devout Christian, an uncompromising Catholic, a tender and vigilant shepherd, the spiritual Father of Christendom, the visible Head of the Church, the Vicegerent of God on earth ; and he can be no Liberal, no Socialist, no political and social reformer, in the sense of this age, — no prince to deserve the sympathy of a De la Mennais or a Horace Greeley, any more than of a Ledru Rollin or a Proudhon. We know beforehand that he cannot sanction what we have presented as the principles and motives of the popular movements of the day ; for the Church in General Council and through her Sovereign Pontiffs has repeatedly and unequivocally condemned them ; and he himself has condemned them, in condemning *Communism*, only another name for Socialism, and in enjoining respect and obedience to princes, — as any one may see who will read his *Epistola Encyclica* copied into this journal for April, 1847, or the several Allocutions in which he has explained his policy.

No man has been more grossly misrepresented by pretended friends and real enemies than Pius the Ninth. The admirers of the old order, — few in number, however, — alarmed at the magnitude of his proposed changes in the government and administration of his temporal dominions, perhaps offended because he did not ask or follow their advice, very naturally opposed him and sought to make him appear to be carried away by the spirit of the age, and pursuing a policy which must hurry the world into the abyss of Radicalism ; on the other hand, Radicals, Socialists, Freemasons, and Carbonari claimed him as one of themselves, because they wished to use the authority of his name and position to stir up the Catholic populations to rebellion, and to cover their own revolutionary and anarchical purposes. We share neither in the alarm of the former nor in the wish of the latter. We form our judgment of Pius the Ninth neither from Greeley's *Tribune*, nor from the Roman correspondence of the London *Morning News* ; but from well-known Catholic principles, his obvious position, and his own official documents. Interpreted by these, he has only

followed, with singular fidelity and firmness, the policy uniformly pursued by his predecessors.

As to his having sanctioned the principles and motives of the popular movements of the day, there is nothing in it. The thing, *in hac providentia*, is simply impossible. The Church, it is certain and undeniable, is wedded to no particular form of government or of social organization. She stakes her existence neither on imperialism nor on feudalism, neither on monarchy nor on democracy. To no one or other of them does she commit herself, and she declares each of them to be a legitimate form of government when and where it exists with no legal claimant against it. But the principle of these movements is exclusive democracy ; — not that democracy is a legitimate form of government, which is true ; not that in these times, the views of the age being what they are, it is, with some restrictions, the best form of government, which we do not deny ; but that the democratic is the *only* legitimate form of government, that all other forms are illegitimate, usurpations, tyrannies, to which the people owe no allegiance, and which they may, when they please, or believe it will be for their interest, conspire to overthrow. This is the principle implied in these movements, and which the Liberals pretend that Pius the Ninth has sanctioned. But he has done no such thing. The Church cannot accept this principle, because it would bind her to democracy, as her enemies a few years ago alleged that she was bound to monarchy, and compel her to declare all other forms of government illegal, and their acts null and void from the beginning. It would erect democracy into a dogma of faith. If the people now establishing democracies should hereafter become tired of them, and wish to reëstablish monarchy, — not an impossible supposition, — they would be obliged to renounce their religion before they could do it. The Church could make no concession to them, and would be compelled, by the invariable nature of faith, to command them to return to democracy, on pain of losing their souls. She would then not only be herself enslaved to democracy, but would be obliged to enslave the people to it also, and to prohibit them under any circumstances and in every country from ever adopting any other form, how much soever they might desire it. Forms of government, like all things human, are changeable, and it is impossible to keep the people always and everywhere satisfied with any one form. What more unreasonable and more impolitic, then, than to bind them by religion always and everywhere to one and the same specific form ?

We are opposing, we are advocating, no particular form of government. In themselves considered, forms of government are matters of indifference. The wise and just administration of government is always a matter of moment, — the form, abstractly considered, never. Man's true good is as attainable under one form of government or social organization as another ; for it is obtained, if obtained at all, from a source wholly independent of the temporal order. That good the Church does and must seek, and its necessary condition is true liberty. To assume, as these social movements do, that this liberty is possible only under a given form of government and social organization would be to maintain that the Church can discharge her mission only where that particular form of government and social organization exists. The first thing her missionaries to a country where that form does not exist must attempt would then be to revolutionize the state and reorganize society. The American people, to a very considerable extent, suppose this to be the fact ; and, supposing monarchy to be the favorite form, maintain that the spread of Catholicity here must essentially destroy our popular form of government, and introduce forms similar to those which the people in the Old World are now laboring to throw off. Substitute democracy for monarchy, and the doctrine we oppose is precisely that which our adversaries allege against us. Are we to adopt it ? Are we to believe that Pius the Ninth adopts it, and requires us to understand that all but democratic nations are out of the way of salvation, placed out of the condition of attaining to any good here or hereafter ?

Since we hold that forms of government are indifferent, that there is evil only in sin, and that our good comes exclusively from the Christian order, we deny the necessity of political and social changes ; and since, to seek our good from them is to seek it from the temporal order instead of the spiritual, which is in principle a rejection of Christianity and a return to heathenism, we censure them. But the minds of the people may be perverted and their hearts corrupted, and we, in consequence, unable to make them see where their true good lies, or to induce them even to give us their attention while we point it out to them. They may be intent on certain political changes, mad for them, and have ears, eyes, hearts, and hands for nothing else. We may condemn their state of mind, the moral disposition in which we find them, but it is a fact we have to meet, and deal with as a fact. In such cases, if the concession of the changes demanded involves no departure from faith or

morals, it is wise to make it, in some sense, necessary, as a means of removing the *prohibens*, as we use logic with an unbeliever in order to remove the obstacles he finds in his mind to the reception of the faith. When political or social changes for this purpose become necessary, it is never the part of wisdom to resist them; authority should always be free to concede them; and that it may be is one reason why it cannot and should not be bound to any particular form of government or social organization.

Pius the Ninth has evidently acted on the principle we here commend. He found, on his accession to the pontifical throne, his own immediate temporal subjects and the European populations generally mad for popular institutions, and not to be satisfied with any thing else. They were ripe for revolt, and prepared to attempt the acquisition of popular government in some form, at all hazards, — if necessary, by insurrection, violent and bloody revolution. They had lost all respect for their rulers, and would no longer listen to the voice of their pastors, — would listen to nothing, in fact, that was opposed to their dominant passion. What was to be done? There were but two alternatives possible. Authority must either repress them by the strong arm of physical force, or attempt to tranquillize them and save them from civil war and anarchy by the concession of popular institutions. The former had been adopted, had been tried, was in actual operation, and it was evident to the casual observer that it only aggravated the evil, only alienated still more and more the hearts of the people from their sovereigns, and from the Church, in consequence of her supposed sympathy with monarchy, and it was clear that it could not last much longer. Nothing was left that could be tried with any hopes of a favorable issue, but the latter alternative. Pius the Ninth saw this, — indeed, most statesmen saw it, — and, anxious for the peace and order of his dominions, and to remove from the minds of all whatever accidental obstacles there might be to their listening to the lessons of religion, he resolved to adopt it; and accordingly proceeded to give his subjects a constitutional government, and, by his example at least, recommended to the European sovereigns to do as much for theirs, and to do it cheerfully, ungrudgingly, and in good faith. The policy came, indeed, too late to effect all the good that was hoped, and to avert all the evil that was threatened; yet that, under the circumstances, it was wise and prudent, nay, even necessary, there really seems to us no room to doubt. We may have regretted the circumstances which called for it, but we have

never for a moment doubted, or thought of doubting, its wisdom or its necessity, although from the first we apprehended the consequences which have followed, and that it would hasten the outbreak of the European populations, which we knew the ill-disposed were preparing; and we have never believed its immediate effect in pacifying the excited multitudes would be as great as some of our friends, whose confidence in the people is greater than ours, expected it would be.

The adoption of this policy, the policy of concession to the exigencies of the times, implies no sanction by the Holy Father of the principles and motives of those popular movements and demands which made it necessary or advisable, nor of the political and social changes we have spoken against. We have been addressing the people and endeavouring to show them what is proper for them to seek, not attempting to point out to authority what it should do; for we have no vocation to instruct authority in its duties. We are of the people, and we only point out what our religion enjoins upon them and us. It may be very just, very wise, nay, very necessary, at times, for authority to concede what it is very wrong, very foolish, on the part of the people to demand. The children of Israel, in the time of Samuel, afford us a case in point. They demanded of the Lord a king, that they might be like other nations. The Lord rebuked them, told them they knew not what they asked, and unrolled before them the oppressions to which a compliance with their request would subject them. Nevertheless, he complied with it, and gave them a king. The question before Pius the Ninth was not the question we have been discussing. The movements existed, the people demanded popular institutions, and were resolved, come what might, to attempt them. The simple question for him was, How shall this state of things be treated? He said to the princes in answer, "Give the people what they ask." This he was free to do, because the Church is wedded to no political or social order, to monarchy no more than to democracy, is as independent of the throne as of the tribune, and can be as much at home in a republic as anywhere else.

If any of our readers suppose that we have any partiality to the old monarchical governments of Europe, as such, they entirely misapprehend us. Have we not said, over and over again, that forms of government are indifferent? Those old monarchies have but ill discharged their obligations to the people; they have sins enough on their heads to sink them; and let them sink to rise no more for ever. We have no tears

to shed over them on their own account. They deserve their fate, for their corruption, for the injustice they have practised, for the war they have made on the Church, and their sacrilegious attempts to chain up the word of God. If, on the other hand, our readers suppose it is the establishment of popular government that we would arrest, they also entirely misapprehend us. How can we oppose popular government, when we hold forms of government to be indifferent? What we insist on is not monarchy or democracy, but *loyalty* on the part of the people; and what we condemn is not the destruction of monarchy, or the establishment of popular government, but the irreligiousness and worldly-mindedness of the people, the principles and motives which lead them to believe that popular institutions are essential to their happiness, and that they have a right to introduce them by casting off their allegiance to existing legal governments. And we do this, because the people, while governed by these principles and motives, are out of the condition to receive any good, and because they will be as ready to overthrow republicanism, when once they have got it, as they are now to overthrow monarchy. The Church can coexist with popular institutions as well as with any other, but she cannot coexist with the principles and motives which now lead the people to demand them, and to rise in rebellion to obtain them.

What is to be the result of the movements of the day we know not. The old monarchies may be swept away, or they may partially recover, and linger on for ages to come; but that does not disturb us. Old Imperial Rome and old Roman civilization were broken down by the irruption of the Northern barbarians, and the world was deluged with barbarism, but the Church remained standing, and did not become barbarian; the feudalism of the Middle Ages, a system, as somebody has said, too perfect for its time, fell beneath the combined attacks of kings and people, but the Church survived, and beheld undismayed its funeral pile; modern monarchy may follow, and all the world become democratic, still the Church will survive, and remain in all her integrity, shorn of none of her glory, and deprived of none of her resources. Over no changes of this sort do we weep. We have no fears for the Church; we fear only for men. If we saw the people making war on the old political system in consequence of its wars on religion, and struggling for popular institutions in order to rescue the Church from her bondage, and to secure her an open field and fair play for the future, we should hear the volleys of musketry and the roar of cannon, and witness the charge, the siege and

sack of cities, with tolerable composure ; for then the war would be one of vengeance on the old governments for the insults they have offered to the Immaculate Spouse of God, and for the freedom of worship, the only war in which real glory ever is or can be acquired. But, alas ! we see nothing of all this. These enraged populations are moved by no regard for religion, they are to a fearful extent the bitter enemies of religious freedom, and governed by a malignant hatred of the Church. They are seeking only an earthly end, and they loathe the Christian order. Here is the source of our anxiety, the ground of our fears, — not for the Church, not for ourselves, but for them. They threaten to be more violent enemies to religion than any kings have been since the persecuting emperors of pagan Rome ; and the conduct of the Swiss radicals, the imprisonment of the noble Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva in the castle of Chillon, and the persecution of the children of St. Alphonsus by the people of Vienna, reveal but too plainly the spirit which animates them, and tell us but too distinctly what, at least for a time, we are to expect from the triumph of the popular party. Nevertheless, a wise and just Providence rules, and these things are permitted only as mercies or judgments upon the nations. It is ours to humble ourselves and adore ; and always have we this consolation, that no evil can befall us against our will, and that always and everywhere may we secure every good by unreserved submission to God in his Church.

ART. V. — LITERARY NOTICES AND CRITICISMS.

1. — *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations and Anglican Claims to Apostolical Succession examined.* By PETER RICHARD KENRICK, Archbishop of St. Louis. *Second Edition, revised and augmented ; in which are inserted Replies to "Essays on Anglican Ordinations, by a Layman" ; and "Anglican Ordinations Valid."* By JOHN FULLER RUSSELL, B. C. L., Incumbent of St. James's, Enfield. Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey. 1848. 8vo. pp. 342.

OUR readers will find in this work a full and satisfactory view of the question of Anglican ordinations and Anglican claims to Apostolical succession, and in detail all the evidence requisite to sustain the positions we have assumed in reference to the subject in

a foregoing article on *Hawkstone, or Oxfordism*, which we had written before we received it. A work from the learned Archbishop of St. Louis can stand in no need of our commendation, and for us, as laymen, to say we are highly pleased with it would be only a piece of impertinence. The work is one of great learning and ability, the argument is conducted with great fairness and skill, and must be conclusive to every reader who is not incapable of perceiving that two and two make four. It exhausts the erudition of the subject, and leaves us nothing to be desired. It drives Anglicans from every ground they assume or can assume, and leaves them a chance not even to cavil. If they read it, it can be only by downright dishonesty or judicial blindness that they ever after venture even to pretend to have either orders or jurisdiction. The Archbishop completely unchurches them, and proves beyond the possibility of a rational doubt that they have nothing but a lay-ministry, that they have not so much as even heretical or schismatical bishops, and that the emphasis with which, in addressing Presbyterians and Congregationalists, they call themselves *the Church* is saved from being ridiculous only by its impudence. We commend the work to the serious study of Episcopalians generally, and of our friend of *The New York Churchman* in particular. The Low Churchmen, as little sympathy as we can have with them, we must believe are far truer to the real interests of Anglicanism than the High Churchmen.

We are far less interested in denying the validity of Anglican ordinations than is commonly supposed; in fact, we wish we could establish their validity; for, if Anglicans had valid orders, one obstacle to their return to Catholic unity would be removed. Hence it is that some Catholics have gone even farther than the evidence warrants in their concessions. Towards the Episcopalians as a body external to the Church we have no special hostility, and we would not represent them as more destitute than they really are. As a church, they are no better than Socinians; but inasmuch as they assert the necessity of orders and Apostolic succession, they fight our battles with the other Protestant sects of the day, and in reality serve us against Protestantism in general. We would therefore, under this point of view, strengthen rather than weaken them, if we could. But their pretensions are so utterly unfounded, that we are forced, even against our will, to expose them. This Dr. Kenrick has done, and done effectually. However earnestly they may hereafter assert the necessity of Apostolic succession, and exclaim, "No bishop, no church," they must concede that their doctrine condemns no sect more surely or more severely than their own.

This is the second edition of Dr. Kenrick's work. How far it differs from the first, or how extensive are the additions he has made, we are unable to say; for we have never read the first

edition. It was published before the question it discusses had acquired an interest for us, and since that time it has never fallen in our way but for a few moments. We can only say it was highly esteemed by Catholics, and gave Anglicans great uneasiness. The present edition, we cannot doubt, is much superior to it, and it happily supplies an important gap in our controversial literature. Taken in connection with the *Primacy of the Apostolic See*, by the author's brother, the eminent prelate who presides with so much success over the Diocese of Philadelphia, it leaves nothing to be desired on the controversy with Anglicanism. It adds another to the important contributions for which our Catholic literature is indebted to Irishmen in general, and to the learned brothers Kenrick in particular. Happily, our religion is Catholic, and knows no national boundaries or geographical lines, or we might feel mortified, as an American, that nearly all the really valuable contributions to our Catholic literature are made by scholars born and educated abroad. But this is as it should be. It is in the order of Divine Providence. The nations that have the faith carry it to those who have it not. The first teachers of the Gentiles were Jews, and the first missionaries of the Gospel in any country have rarely, perhaps never, been natives of that country. No matter; all are fellow-citizens in the commonwealth of Christ, all are brothers in the unity of the spirit. Deep is the debt of gratitude we as Americans owe to foreign countries, and especially to Ireland; and how silly are they who cherish a feeling of narrow nationality! We despise the fraternity of the Socialists, we love that of the Gospel; and whose loves and honors the blessed old Church of God, our venerable Mother, is our countryman, our kinsman, our brother, nourished at the same breast with us, — wherever he was born or brought up, or whatever the idiom he speaks. Catholicity, and it alone, gives true brotherhood, melting all nations, all families, and all hearts into one, with one Father, one Mother, one love. There are no Irish, French, German, or American Catholics; for, the moment we become Catholics, all those distinctions vanish, and we have but one country, one *patria*, — heaven, — and but one wish, one hope, — to dwell in it for ever.

-
2. — *Poems*. By WM. T. BACON. Cambridge: George Nichols. 1848. 16mo. pp. 275.

WE have acquired the reputation of being a narrow-minded and bigoted critic, unable to see any thing beautiful or meritorious in any work that does not happen to square with our own philosophical and religious principles. This reputation, except as to the bigotry and narrow-mindedness predicated of it, is merited, and the one, so far

as we seek reputation at all, we wish to secure. The first thing to be exacted in any literary work is truth, and we know not what other standard of truth a man can have than his philosophical and religious principles. A work faulty as to its principles and in error as to its doctrines cannot be commendable, whatever the genius, talent, or taste of its author. Art simply as art is indifferent to good or evil, and becomes the one or the other according to the thought or sentiment it expresses; and the standard by which to test whether that thought or sentiment be the one or the other is always and everywhere Christian faith and morals.

The greater part of the popular literature of the day, whether poetry or prose, proceeds on the assumption, that man is morally perfect and perfectible, which is self-contradictory, and false in both its parts. Proceeding on this assumption, all it seeks in its expression is truth to man, to human nature. Now this truth is never enough, and may often be an objection. Moore's *Loves of the Angels* and Byron's *Don Juan* are true to human nature, and the truest in the very parts which are the most objectionable. The obscene is as natural as the pure, the indelicate as the delicate, the immoral as the moral. All nature is not to be expressed; all natural sentiments, even though pure in themselves, are not proper to be appealed to. Our nature is fallen, is corrupt, rotten, and can never be safely trusted to its own guidance. Any book which appeals to sentiments and feelings, though natural to the human heart and experienced by all men at times, which Christian morals require us to control, mortify, or subdue, is a bad book, and, however hearty the response it finds in our own bosoms, however exquisite it may be under the relation of art, must be condemned, and should be read by nobody. How, then, can we praise it? Wherefore should we waive its moral tendency, and enlarge upon the genius, the skill, and the taste of its author? Dress is important, — but it is for the man, not he for it. Shall we waive the man, and pay all our attention to his clothes?

As a critic we wish to be liberal, and we know we are good-natured, but we cannot lose sight of principle; we cannot sacrifice truth in the matter to beauty in the form, — the thought to the expression. Literary works are sent us by our Protestant friends to be reviewed. The fact that they are written by Protestants, in itself considered, weighs nothing. We can relish a good book, if a good book, written by a Protestant, as well as one written by a Catholic. But the fact is, Protestants do not and cannot write good books, that is, good in the estimation of Catholics. Not that they want genius, not that they lack cultivation, learning, artistic skill, or a true appreciation of certain orders of beauty. In what regards the literary form, the style, the expression, we would that our Catholic writers were not so far below them as they too often

are. Here, at least in our own language, we cheerfully acknowledge their excellence, and confess our own inferiority. They dress better than we do. But when we come to that which they dress, — the important thing, — we are thrown all aback; we have no word of commendation to offer. We understand what they write. We can easily place ourselves in their position, and appreciate what they present from their point of view; but that point of view is false, is one from which the truth in its normal relations cannot be seen. They see the universe, so to speak, on its back side, not in front, and can no more judge of its real order and beauty than a stranger could judge of the beauty and order of the houses on one of the streets of our city by looking at them only from the rear. The universe can be seen in its order and harmony, or its contents in their real relations and due proportions, only from the point of view of Catholicity. From any other point of view, here and there an isolated object, a tree, a palace, a star, or a flower may appear beautiful, and please the taste; but as a whole it has no form or comeliness, — is huge, broken, confused, thrown together by chance, without plan, rule, or measure, — and the only orderly and symmetrical universe the beholder can look upon is the one he more or less successfully projects from himself. Now how can we, who are placed by our religion in a position to see the universe from the point of view of its Creator, to behold the world through the design of God himself, clothed with the reality, the order, the harmony, the proportion, the beauty and grandeur, it receives from his Divine mind, content ourselves to gaze on that mimic universe, pale and obscure, lying in the debatable region between something and nothing, which man projects from his own soul? Shall we take the human, when we already have the Divine? — feed on husks with swine, when we have the food of angels?

The reader can easily understand, then, why we cannot speak as highly of this beautifully printed volume of poems before us, as its simple literary merits might seem to demand. The author has a good ear, and in general the rhythm and flow of his verses are unexceptionable. He has a reflective cast of mind, much poetic feeling, and, though not a perfectly chaste fancy, yet a quick eye for simple beauty. He is too diffuse as a writer, wants terseness and vigor of expression, and affects a warmth and an energy that are foreign to his nature. He dilates too much on external nature, and seems not to be aware that material objects are never poetical, save as informed by the soul of the poet. Poetry, like all art, comes from within, and not from without, and nothing without is poetical save as made so by an inward sentiment which the poet projects into it, — a truth which Wordsworth and his school do not appear to have learned.

In a moral point of view, from the stand-point of the age, these

poems are unexceptionable. They never rise above, and rarely fall below, ordinary Protestant morality, that is, heathenism. They betray now and then the doubt which begins to reveal itself in Euripides, and becomes marked in the philosophers; but it seeks to hide itself under the flimsy guise of sentiment. The poet, when he reflects, doubts; but when he abandons himself to sentiment, he cherishes the hope of a "sunnier sphere."

"Is the glow of life dead? — shall it never wake again?
Is its joy all departed, and comes it not here?
Nay, we cannot thus deem man is left to complain,
But we must still believe there 's a sunnier sphere."

Yet this is only the heathen's immortality, the hope of Elysium, not of the Christian heaven. We have found here and there a Christian doctrine recognized in the volume, but the thought and sentiment throughout are heathen, save in classic beauty and force of expression. Nevertheless, Mr. Bacon is not alone in this. We can find Christian doctrines in Wordsworth, but the sentiment is usually heathen, though heathen sentiment in its more respectable form. What we say of Wordsworth we may say *a fortiori* of Protestant poets in general. The age is heathen, and wherefore should not its literature be heathen? Our Protestant readers, however, may find in Mr. Bacon's poems much to please them, and they will find nothing to harm them. They will not find him a poet in the full sense of the word, but yet they will find in him one who is at times visited with genuine poetic inspiration. His lighter poems are pleasant; his graver attempts do not appear to us equally successful. He, however, has made commendable progress since we greeted him in the *Boston Quarterly Review* some eleven years ago, and if we were what we were then, we should give him a warmer welcome than we then gave him, for many of his poems would serve well to while away the cheerless hours of one whose brightest anticipations are the Elysian fields or the Islands of the Blest.

-
3. *European Agriculture and Rural Economy, from Personal Observation.* By HENRY COLMAN. Vol. II. Parts IX. and X. Boston: A. D. Phelps. 1848. 8vo.

THESE two Parts complete Mr. Colman's Report on European Agriculture and Rural Economy. We have read the work, for the most part, with pleasure and instruction. It contains a great amount of useful and interesting information, nowhere else, to our knowledge, so easily accessible. Mr. Colman is an enthusiast in the cause of agriculture, and in some preliminary observations to his

completed work makes some suggestions, the full value of which, we are inclined to think, even he does not appreciate. In an economical point of view, or under the relation of material well-being, society generally never presented so gloomy an aspect as at the present moment. Wonderful improvements have been made in the productive arts, and the wealth of the world would seem to have been greatly augmented; but it cannot be denied that there is a mass of poverty and pauperism in the most civilized wealthy nations never before witnessed, and, what is worse, frightfully on the increase. Even the temperate, the able-bodied, and the industrious by thousands and thousands are reduced to beggary or to subsist by public charity, solely because they can find no employment. Hence the cry we hear, of the "right to work," that is, the right of the laborer to an employment by which he can obtain, at least, a physical subsistence, — a cry which, in the present state of things, with men's tempers as they are, will not be soon or easily stifled, however mad may be the attempts of the laboring classes to better their condition.

Mr. Colman seems to us to approach the cause of this state of things, when he states that the land has been deserted, and the people have flocked into cities and towns. The real cause is to be found in the immoderate extent to which, by means of banking and an artificial credit system, we have pushed trade and manufactures, by which we have substituted, so to speak, large industries for small. The capital employed in trade and manufactures is able to impose a tax on that employed in agriculture and domestic industry. As long as the trader and manufacturer, industrial and commercial, instead of agricultural, capital, rule the state, and make or inspire its laws, whether directly or indirectly, the terrible state of things now existing will not only remain, but will every day continue to grow worse. Nothing but a return to agriculture, and to domestic industry as it existed before your huge factories were heard of, can correct it. How shocking it is to see a country, like Ireland, with one third of her soil uncultivated, and her people dying of starvation! How easily, if the landlords only understood their duty, or even their worldly interests, could they remedy the evil! If, instead of wasting their income in gambling, debauchery, vice, and crime, and racking their tenantry to death, they would devote only a small portion of it to furnishing employment to labor in improving the cultivation of their estates and reclaiming waste lands, these heartless landlords could easily remove the vast amount of physical suffering which now exists in Ireland, take away the occasion of no small portion of that vice and crime which they now harp upon, and save themselves from those curses of the poor they oppress or neglect, which must sink them to the lowest hell. But this is a subject to which we must return at our earliest convenience; for if we preach

submission to the people, and condemn their attempts to better their condition by revolutions, it is from no sympathy with the system or the tyrants of which they are the victims. Men may submit to wrong, and, if they do it in the spirit of penance, they will find their account in it; but no man has a right to inflict wrong, and whoever does it, especially whoever inflicts it upon the helpless and unoffending, or, having the power to better their condition, refuses to do it, deserves the reprobation of mankind, as he will not fail to receive that of Almighty God. We owe all to God, and, because we can give him nothing, he puts our neighbour in his place, and what we owe to God bids us give to him.

4. *Hewet's Edition of the Pictorial Catholic New Testament, under the Editorial Supervision of the RIGHT REVEREND JOHN HUGHES, Bishop of New York. To be embellished with Numerous Engravings executed in the Best Style of the Art.* New York: Hewet & Spooner. 1848. Nos. 1 and 2.

THE name of the Right Reverend the Bishop of New York is a sufficient guaranty of the accuracy of the text, and Catholics may without scruple purchase this edition of the New Testament. The illustrations are copied from the works of distinguished masters, and are very well executed; but the assertion of the publishers on the cover, that "it is the most beautifully illustrated book of the day," can be regarded only as a bookseller's puff, which we are sorry to see in so close connection with the Holy Scriptures. The letter-press is creditable.

5. *The Catholic Almanac for 1849.* Baltimore: F. Lucas, jr. 32mo. pp. 32.

WE have no occasion to recommend this useful and interesting annual. It might, however, be much improved by a little more editorial labor, and by suppressing a portion of the reading matter, and enlarging the statistical department. The present is, nevertheless, superior to any of the preceding numbers which we have seen.

6. *The American Almanac and Repository of Useful Knowledge for the Year 1849.* Boston: Little & Brown. 16mo. pp. 369.

THIS is the twentieth volume of the American Almanac, and the tenth of the new series. It is truly a "Repository of Useful

Knowledge," and we can cheerfully recommend it to all our readers. It is the best volume of the *American Almanac*, as far as we can judge, which has yet appeared.

7. *Ralphton: the Young Carolinian of 1776. A Romance on the Philosophy of Politics.* By A. H. BRISBANE. Charleston: Burgess & James, Printers. 1848. 12mo. pp. 242.

THE author of this book, which is execrably printed, is not A. Brisbane of New York, the well-known Fourierist, although he may be his kinsman. From his general professions, we should infer that he claims to be a Catholic. He is evidently a man of very considerable ability, strong philanthropic feelings, and unbounded enthusiasm. What we think of his work our readers may collect from our well-known views of Socialism, and of conforming to the spirit of the age. We glory in being a Catholic of "the Dark Ages," and in shutting our eyes to the *new light* of the nineteenth century. What we object to in *Ralphton*, however, is its philosophy. The new industrial arrangements the author proposes, separated from that philosophy, and regarded merely as economical arrangements, may or may not, for aught we know, be worthy of adoption.

8. *Wild Flowers, Sacred Poetry.* By the ABBÉ ADRIAN ROQUETTE. New Orleans: O'Donnell. 1848. 12mo. pp. 72.

THIS *brochure* is got up in the true Parisian style, with great beauty and elegance. The poems are marked by much sweetness, are full of tender and devout feeling, and are fair specimens of what they profess to be. The author tells us that he sings in a language which he does not know, but he manages it as if it were his mother tongue.

* * * This number commences the third volume of the new series, and offers to our friends a favorable opportunity to use their exertions to extend the circulation of the work. The first series of the work can no longer be supplied, but we have several copies of the new series on hand, beginning with the year 1847. The new series is not connected with the first, and those who commence with 1847 do virtually take the work from its beginning. New subscribers would therefore do well to take the two back volumes, which

will enable them to have the work complete. To subscribers who will transmit us seven dollars in current money, free of expense to us, we will send one copy of the work for the years 1847, 1848, and 1849, which is, as they will perceive, a very liberal discount.

Our readers will perceive from this number that we are proposing to give our Review a more popular character, of entering more largely into the discussion of the great practical questions of the day, and are aiming to adapt it to the interests of a wider class of readers. We cannot, as Catholics, blink the great political and social questions which are now agitating the public mind both at home and abroad, and these questions will receive more attention from us hereafter than we have heretofore given them. It is of great importance to our community that these questions should be freely and boldly discussed in the light of Catholic faith and morals, and we are sure that a Catholic journal that shall so discuss them will, if it finds here and there an enemy, never want friends. The time has come when Catholics must begin to make their principles tell on the public sentiment of the country. Heretofore we have taken our politics from one or another of the parties which divide the country, and have suffered the enemies of our religion to impose their political doctrines on us; but it is time for us to begin to teach the country itself those moral and political doctrines which flow from the teachings of our own Church. We are at home here, wherever we may have been born; this is our country, and as it is to become thoroughly Catholic, we have a deeper interest in public affairs than any other class of our fellow-citizens. The sects are only for a day; the Church is for ever. We care little how the elections go, for that is a small affair; but we can never, as Catholics, be indifferent to the moral principles which enter into the laws and shape the public policy of the country.

We enter now upon the fifth year of our Catholic life; we have, through the grace of God, falsified the predictions of our friends that we should turn back to Protestantism in six months, and rendered it idle for people to repeat their old nonsense about "changing with every moon." Since we left Protestantism, we have escaped the lunar influences to which we were formerly subjected, and come under those of the Sun of Justice, which are not liable to vary. We have had no wish to return to what we have abjured, are satisfied where we are, and wish, from our heart, all our old and new friends

A HAPPY NEW YEAR.